WAYS OF RUSSIAN THEOLOGY

PART TWO

VOLUME SIX
in ***THE COLLECTED WORKS*** of

GEORGES FLOROVSKY
Emeritus Professor of Eastern Church History
Harvard University

General Editor
RICHARD S. HAUGH
Visiting Scholar
Andover Newton Theological School

Translated by
ROBERT L. NICHOLS

BÜCHERVERTRIEBSANSTALT
Postfach 461, FL - 9490 Vaduz, Europa
[Exclusive Sales Agent: Notable & Academic Books
P. O. Box 470, Belmont, MA {USA} 02178]

WAYS OF RUSSIAN THEOLOGY
PART TWO

CONTENTS

IN MEMORIAM vii

AUTHOR'S PREFACE x

EDITOR'S PREFACE xi

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE xii

CHAPTER SIX – PHILOSOPHICAL AWAKENING 1
I. The Birth of Russian Philosophy
II. Creation of a Theological Consciousness
III. The "Lovers of Wisdom" and other Moscow "Circles"
IV. Chaadaev and the Men of the 1840s
V. Ivan Kireevskii
VI. N. V. Gogol
VII. A. S. Khomiakov – "Knight of Orthodoxy"
VIII. Dialectical or Organic Wholeness: Samarin and Khomiakov
IX. "Building in the Desert" – Russian Nihilism of the 1860s
X. History and the Holy Life
XI. Negation and Return
XII. N. F. Fedorov: The Common Cause
XIII. Conclusion

CHAPTER SEVEN – THE HISTORICAL SCHOOL 105
I. The Church and the Great Reforms
II. Ecclesiastical Journalism
III. The Askochenskii Bukharev Debate
IV. The Russian Bible
V. Reforming the Ecclesiastical Schools
VI. History and Ecclesiastical Self-Awareness
VII. Dogma: The Meaning of Church History
VIII. The Ideal of the Spiritual Life
IX. Lev Tolstoi – Educated Sectarian
X. Prohibition of Questioning
XI. The Theology of "Moral Monism"
XII. Maksim Matveevich Tareev
XIII. The Theological Moralism of Viktor Nesmelov
XIV. Conclusion

CHAPTER EIGHT – ON THE EVE 233
I. An End and a Beginning
II. The Seductive Path of Vladimir Solov'ev
III. The St. Petersburg Religious-Philosophical Meetings
IV. The Question of Reforms
V. Religion in Philosophy and Art
VI. Religious Philosophy in the Pre-War Decade
VII. The End of the Petrine Era

CHAPTER NINE – BREAKS AND LINKS 287
I. Irresponsibility in the National Spirit
II. The Schism between the Intelligentsia and the People
III. The Break with Patristic Tradition
IV. The Truth of Orthodoxy
V. A New Age of Theology
VI. The Task of Orthodoxy

NOTES TO CHAPTERS SIX THROUGH NINE 310-377

IN MEMORIAM

FR. GEORGES FLOROVSKY
1893-1979

"Preeminent Orthodox Christian Theologian, Ecumenical Spokesman, And Authority on Russian Letters."

[All quotations are from pages 5 and 11 of the *Harvard Gazette* of October 1, 1982, written by George H. Williams, Hollis Professor of Divinity *Emeritus*, Harvard Divinity School and Edward Louis Keenan, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University and "placed upon the records" at the Harvard Faculty of Divinity Meeting on September 16, 1982.]

"Archpriest Professor Georges Vasilyevich Florovsky (1893-1979), preeminent theologian of Orthodoxy and historian of Christian thought, ecumenical leader and interpreter of Russian literature . . . died in Princeton, New Jersey in his 86th year" on August 11, 1979.

Born in Odessa in 1893, Fr. Florovsky was the beneficiary of that vibrant Russian educational experience which flourished toward the end of the 19th century and produced many gifted scholars. His father was rector of the Theological Academy and dean of the Cathedral of the Transfiguration. His mother, Klaudia Popruzhenko, was the daughter of a professor of Hebrew and Greek. Fr. Florovsky's first schoiarly work, "On Reflex Salivary Secretion," written under one of Pavlov's students, was published in English in 1917 in the last issue of *The Bulletin of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.*

In 1920, with his parents and his brother Antonii, Fr. Florovsky left Russia and settled first in Sophia, Bulgaria. He left behind his brother, Vasilii, a surgeon, who died in the 1924 famine, and his sister Klaudia V. Florovsky, who became a professor of history at the University of Odessa. In 1921 the President of Czechoslovakia, Thomas Masaryk, invited Fr. Florovsky and his brother Antonii to Prague. Fr. Florovsky taught the philosophy of law. Antonii later became a professor of history at the University of Prague.

In 1922 Georges Florovsky married Xenia Ivanovna Simonova and they resettled in Paris where he became cofounder of St. Sergius Theological Institute and taught there as professor of patristics (1926-1948). In 1932 he was ordained a priest and placed himself canonically under the patriarch of Constantinople.

In 1948 he came to the United States and was professor of theology at St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary from 1948 to 1955, and dean from 1950. From 1954 to 1965 he was professor of Eastern Church History at Harvard Divinity School and, concurrently (1962-1965) an associate of the Slavic Department and (1955-1959) an associate professor of theology at Holy Cross Theological School.

"Although Fr. Florovsky's teaching in the Slavic Department [at Harvard University] was only sporadic, he became a major intellectual influence in the formation of a generation of American specialists in Russian cultural history. His lasting importance in this area derives not from his formal teaching but from the time and thought he gave to informal "circles" that periodically arose around him in Cambridge among those who had read *The Ways of Russian Theology* [then only in Russian], for decades a kind of "underground book" among serious graduate students of Russian intellectual history, and had sought him out upon discovering that he was at the Divinity School . . . During a portion of his incumbency at Harvard . . . patristics and Orthodox thought and institutions from antiquity into 20th century Slavdom flourished. In the Church History Department meetings he spoke up with clarity. In the Faculty meetings he is remembered as having energetically marked book catalogues on his lap for the greater glory of the Andover Harvard Library! In 1964 Fr. Florovsky was elected a director of the Ecumenical Institute founded by Paul VI near Jerusalem." Active in both the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, Fr. Florovsky was Vice President-at-Large of the National Council of Churches from 1954 to 1957.

"After leaving Harvard, Professor *Emeritus* Florovsky taught from 1965 to 1972 in Slavic Studies at Princeton University, having begun lecturing there already in 1964; and he was visiting lecturer in patristics at Princeton Theological Seminary as early as 1962 and then again intermittently after retirement from the University. His last teaching was in the fall semester of 1978/79 at Princeton Theological Seminary."

"Fr. Florovsky in the course of his career was awarded honorary doctorates by St. Andrew's University . . . Boston University, Notre Dame, Princeton University, the University of Thessalonica, St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary, and Yale. He was a member or honorary member of the Academy of Athens, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the British Academy, and the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius."

Fr. Florovsky personified the cultivated, well-educated Russian of the turn of the century. His penetrating mind grasped both the detail and depth in the unfolding drama of the history of Christianity in both eastern and western forms. He was theologian, church historian, patristic scholar, philosopher, Slavist, and a writer in comparative literature. "Fr. Florovsky sustained his pleasure on reading English novels, the source in part of his extraordinary grasp of the English language, which, polyglot that he was, he came to prefer above any other for theological discourse and general exposition. Thus when he came to serve in Harvard's Slavic Department, there was some disappointment that he did not lecture in Russian, especially in his seminars on Dostoievsky, Soloviev, Tolstoi, and others. It was as if they belonged to a kind of classical age of the Russian tongue and civilization that, having been swept away as in a deluge, he treated as a Latin professor would Terrence or Cicero, not presuming to give lectures in the tonalities of an age that had vanished forever."

Fr. Florovsky's influence on contemporary church historians and Slavists was vast. The best contemporary multi-volume history of Christian thought pays a special tribute to Fr. Florovsky. Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale University, in the bibliographic section to his first volume in *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, writes under the reference to Fr. Florovsky's two works in Russian on

the Eastern Fathers: "These two works are basic to our interpretation of trinitarian and christological dogmas" (p. 359 from *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition: 100-600*). George Huntston Williams, Hollis Professor *Emeritus* of Harvard Divinity School, wrote: "Faithful priestly son of the Russian Orthodox Church . . . , Fr. Georges Florovsky – with a career-long involvement in the ecumenical dialogue – is today the most articulate, trenchant and winsome exponent of Orthodox theology and piety in the scholarly world. He is innovative and creative in the sense wholly of being ever prepared to restate the saving truth of Scripture and Tradition in the idiom of our contemporary yearning for the transcendent."

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

This book was conceived as an experiment in historical synthesis, as an experiment in the history of Russian thought. Preceding the synthesis, as long ago as the days of my youth, came years of analysis, many years of slow reading and reflection. For me the past fate of Russian theology was always the history of a creative contemporaneity in which I had to find myself. Historical impartiality is not violated in this way. Impartiality is not non-participation. It is not indifference nor a refusal to make an evaluation. History explains events, discloses their meaning and significance. The historian must never forget that he studies and describes the creative tragedy of human life. He must not, for he cannot. Unbiased history has never existed and never will.

Studying the Russian past led me to the conviction and has strengthened me in it that in our day the Orthodox theologian can only find for himself the true measure and living source of creative inspiration in patristic tradition. I am convinced the intellectual break from patristics and Byzantinism was the chief cause for all the interruptions and failures in Russia's development. The history of these failures is told in this book. All the genuine achievements of Russian theology were always linked with a creative return to patristic sources. That this narrow path of patristic theology is the sole true way is revealed with particular clarity in historical perspective. Yet the return to the fathers must not be solely intellectual or historical; it must be a return in spirit and prayer, a living and creative self-restoration to the fullness of the Church in the entirety of sacred tradition.

We are granted to live in an age of theological awakening bespoken throughout the divided Christian world. It is time to reexamine and recall with great attention all the sometimes cruel, sometimes inspired lessons and testaments of the past. But a genuine awakening can only begin when not only the answers but the questions are heard in the past and in the future. The inexhaustible power of patristic tradition in theology is defined still more by the fact that theology was a matter of life for the holy fathers, a spiritual quest (*podvig*), a confession of faith, a creative resolution of living tasks. The ancient books were always inspired with this creative spirit. Healthy theological sensitivity, without which the sought-for Orthodox awakening will not come, can only be restored in our ecclesiastical society through a return to the fathers. In our day theological confessionalism acquires special importance among the Church's labors as the inclusion of the mind and will within the Church, as a living entry of truth into the mind. *Vos exemplaria graeca nocturna versate diurna.* Orthodoxy is once again revealed in patristic exegesis as a conquering power, as the power giving rebirth and affirmation to life, not only as a way station for tired and disillusioned souls; not only as the end but as the beginning, the beginning of a quest and creativity, a "new creature."

In finishing this book, I recall with gratitude all those who by example or counsel, by books and inquiries, by objection, sympathy or reproach helped and help me in my work. I gratefully remember the libraries and repositories whose hospitality I enjoyed during the long years of my studies. Here I must mention one name dear to me, the late P. I. Novgorodtsev, an image of truthfulness who will never die in my heart's memory. I am indebted to him more than can possibly be expressed in words. "True instruction was in his mouth." (*Malachi* 2: 6).

FR. GEORGES FLOROVSKY

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The history of the translation of *Ways of Russian Theology* could by itself be a separate book. Suffice it to say that more persons had a hand in this project than is obvious, especially in the early years of the project. The work of Andrew Blane and friends was quite significant. In late 1974 I received a personal request from Fr. Florovsky to head the entire project and to bring it to completion. I hesitated until Fr. Florovsky insisted that I assume the general editorship of the project. I agreed. From that time on, the organization of the project began anew. The first step was to compare existing translations. The second step was taken when Fr. Florovsky insisted that Robert L. Nichols be appointed the new translator. The third step was to compare the new translation with the original text. And, finally, numerous notes were added for a specific reason. It was thought that there would be two types of readership: theologians who might be unfamiliar with the world of Russian culture in general; and, Slavists who might be unfamiliar with Church history and patristics. It was considered unfair to expect Slavists to know Cappadocian theology, just as it was considered unfair to expect a theologian to know the poetry of Tiutchev. The European publisher responsible for the continuation of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky* made the final decision to retain the notes.

There is no pretense that a perfect product has resulted. There are, obviously, errors still to be uncovered, words which could have been translated with a different nuance, notes which could have been fuller. But in the main the product is ready, especially in light of the fact that a readership has awaited this English translation for almost forty years now.

I would like to thank everyone who, at whatever time or stage in the project, participated. A special debt is owed to Robert L. Nichols and Paul Kachur. This project, as well as the completion of *The Collected Works*, almost fell victim to a series of unfortunate circumstances. A special debt of gratitude extends to Heinz Reuchlin, Jean-Paul Labriolle, Klaus-Martin Richter and to Büchervertriebsanstalt for making the completion of this project and *The Collected Works* possible.

Everyone who has participated in this project would, I think, join in the prayer from the Orthodox service:

"With the saints, O Christ, give rest to the soul of Thy servant, Fr. Georges, where there is neither sickness, nor sorrow, nor sighing, but life everlasting . . . For the ever-memorable servant of God, Fr. Georges, for his repose, tranquillity and blessed memory . . . That the Lord our God will establish his soul in a place of brightness, a place of verdure, a place of rest, where all the righteous dwell . . . O God of all that is spiritual and of all flesh, Who hast trampled down Death . . . and given life unto Thy world, do Thou, the same Lord, give rest to the soul of Thy departed servant, Fr. Georges . . . whence all sickness, sorrow and sighing have fled away . . . For Thou art the Resurrection, and the Life, and the Repose of Thy departed servant, Fr. Georges."

In loving memory.

RICHARD S. HAUGH

Visiting Scholar
Andover Newton Theological School
February 10, 1987

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

Over a hundred and sixty years ago, in 1814, Archimandrite Filaret (Drozdov), then a youthful Orthodox reformer and later "ecumenical" metropolitan of Moscow, drew up a charter for the Russian ecclesiastical schools and submitted it to Tsar Alexander I. From that moment can be dated the awakening of modern Russian Orthodox thought. As Filaret told the learned clergy and laity gathered for the occasion, Orthodoxy had been dazzled and diverted by a series of western religious and cultural enthusiasms and now must "show its face in the true spirit of the Apostolic Church." In an important sense, Filaret's summons to recover and proclaim again the faith of the apostles and the Church fathers was answered when Fr. Georges Florovsky's *Ways of Russian Theology* appeared in 1937 among the Orthodox *émigrés* in Paris. Or, more accurately, the book represented the culmination of more than a century's effort by Russians, beginning with Filaret, to rediscover their own Orthodox tradition.

Ways of Russian Theology forms an integral part of the attempt to purify Russian Orthodoxy by clarifying its proper relationship to the West. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, the Russian Church found itself intellectually unprepared to deal with the religious and cultural storms bursting in upon it. First came the era of open hostilities between Protestants and Catholics; later came the Enlightenment and Romanticism. Consequently, Orthodoxy absorbed, sometimes unconsciously, western scholasticism, deism, pietism, and idealism, and produced what Fr. Florovsky describes as the "pseudomorphosis" of Russia's authentic religious life derived from Byzantium. Only in the nineteenth century did Russian Orthodoxy seriously undertake to recover its Byzantine heritage and find its way "back to the Fathers," thereby laying the foundation for Florovsky's later program of "neopatristic synthesis," a concept he elaborates in his own preface to this book and throughout the study.

Although no one has gone so far as to say about Florovsky what the historian S. M. Solov'ev once said about Filaret ("Every day for lunch he ate two priests and two minnows"), his caustic remarks about prominent figures in Russian history prepared the atmosphere for the cool and critical manner in which the book was received. *Ways of Russian Theology* was not well reviewed [in 1937]. His colleagues at the St. Sergius Institute in Paris collaborated against him in order to shield the students from his influence. Nicholas Berdiaev wrote a long review in *The Way* [*Put*], the leading Orthodox intellectual journal in the Russian emigration, accusing him of arrogance and speaking as though he were God thundering down final judgment on those with whom he disagreed. Many at the Institute saw the book as a full scale attack on Russia and its faith.[1] They resented the acerbic remarks about those who he believed to have surrendered to the West: "Feofan Prokopovich was a dreadful person . . . (He) stands forth not as a westerner, but as a western man, a foreigner . . . (He) viewed the Orthodox world as an outsider and imagined it to be a duplicate of Rome. He simply did not experience Orthodoxy, absorbed as he was in western disputes. In those debates he remained to the end allied with the Protestants." Similarly, Peter Mogila, the great seventeenth-century churchman, is described as a "crypto-Roman." "He brought Orthodoxy to what might be called a Latin 'pseudomorphosis'." And, in a manner which would

inevitably provoke his Parisian associates, Florovsky wrote that " . . . N. A. Berdiaev drank so deeply at the springs of German mysticism and philosophy that he could not break loose from the fatal German circle . . . German mysticism cut him off from the life of the Great Church." Naturally, the book found even fewer friends among the Russian "radicals" in Paris. Paul Miliukov tried to silence the book by refusing to print Professor Bitselli's review in *Russian Notes* [*Russkiia zapiski*].

But aside from the polemical style, why the hostility to the book in Orthodox intellectual circles? Because it effectively questioned the historical basis of many of their strongly held theological views. Florovsky quickly emerged as the most authoritative living voice of Russian Orthodoxy in the West, and he sought to use his position to pose new questions about ecumenicity derived from his reflection on the Russian experience and its Byzantine past. Modern Russian Orthodox ecumenism, if it begins anywhere, begins in Paris with him. Not, of course, only with him, and not only in the 1930s. He had the experience of the preceding century to draw upon. Metropolitan Filaret and the editorial board for the journal *The Works of the Holy Fathers in Russian Translation* obviously anticipated his appeal for a "return to the Fathers." The Orthodox *émigrés* in Paris were working clergy and laymen trying to acclimate Russian Orthodoxy to the ecumenical challenges of the twentieth century. All worked on the same problems: a reexamination of Russia's religious past, the meaning of the Revolution for Russia and the modern world, and the role of Russian Orthodoxy in the present and future.

But among all those who thus served the Church in exile, Fr. Florovsky stands alone. Others might explore and refine Orthodox thought, but Florovsky altered the context in which discussion of the Church's work, meaning, and character must take place. In so doing, he laid the foundation for reconciling the "Eastern and the Oriental" Orthodox Churches. His "asymmetrical" definition of the Chalcedonian formula first appeared in his 1933 lectures on the Byzantine Fathers of the V-VIII centuries. In *Ways of Russian Theology* he clarified the shortcomings, achievements, and tasks of the Russian Church. And in the next few years he defined the necessary approach Eastern Orthodoxy must take in order to overcome separation from the other Christian confessions. In 1937, at the ecumenical encounters in Athens and Edinburgh, he explained his "neopatristic synthesis" or "re-Hellenization" of Orthodoxy in such a way as to exercise "a profound influence upon the . . . (Edinburgh) Conference, presenting the eternal truths of the Catholic Faith so effectively, so winsomely, and so clearly that they commended themselves to men of the most diversified nationalities and religious backgrounds." [2] All this, in its essentials, was carried through in a remarkably short period from 1930 until the outbreak of the war.

The war in Europe claimed *Ways of Russian Theology* as one of its casualties. Nearly the entire stock of the book was destroyed during a bombing raid on Belgrade near which Florovsky had moved to serve as chaplain and religious teacher to the Russian colony at Bela Crkva. Although copies survived there and elsewhere, the book became somewhat rare. The present translation will, therefore, make this monumental work more readily available by bringing it to the attention of a much larger non-Russian speaking English public. The book's great

erudition and compassion deserve the widest possible audience. An English translation has long been overdue.

All translators, if they are to any extent conscious of their work, recognize the disparity between the original they read and the work they produce. On very rare occasions a translator perfectly captures his subject, but far more often he only approximates or suggests the original. This book follows the general rule. Fr. Florovsky's *Ways of Russian Theology* is not an easy book to render into English. It is a highly personal and passionate account of Russian religious thought and Russian culture constructed from words, phrases, and thoughts so deeply rooted in the Russian Orthodox tradition that the English translator can only imperfectly convey their rich associations. Consequently, he must settle for something less, and I have tried to retain the vigor and earnestness of the book by writing English prose rather than providing a literal rendition of the Russian text. I do not claim to have succeeded in capturing Fr. Florovsky's style; I only claim an attempt at avoiding the awkwardness of a more precisely literal reproduction. As Edward Fitzgerald once observed: "the live dog better than the dead lion." (*Letters*, London, 1894).

The translation of *Ways of Russian Theology* is actually a work of many. In 1975, when I first became part of the project, rough drafts of several chapters and sections of others had already been completed. These drafts included a portion of chapter 2, chapters 3 and 4, sections 1-7 of chapter 5, section 14 of chapter 7, and chapters 8 and 9. When at the request of Fr. Florovsky and Richard Haugh, the general editor of this project, I agreed to assume the burden of this project previously carried forward by the earlier group, I extensively revised and in some instances retranslated the chapters already in draft form, and translated the remainder of chapter 5 as well as the preface and chapters 1, 6, and 7. To all the chapters I added numerous explanatory notes. The general editor, Richard Haugh, has appended still others. In sum, the translation is a collective enterprise which has taken considerable time to complete, worked on as it has been during summers, holidays, and at other spare moments in working days devoted to teaching, other literary projects, and administrative duties. Of course, I assume full responsibility for any errors in the translation, but the hard, selfless labor of the previous translators must receive full acknowledgement.

One further word about the notes accompanying the text. Those notes designated within brackets as "Author's notes" are of two kinds. One contains material removed from the body of the text, so that it does not interrupt the narrative. Such material is usually, but not always, of a bibliographic character. The other sort provides information taken from the bibliography at the end of the Russian edition. (That full bibliography is not included with this translation. Readers who wish to use the very extensive Russian bibliography are invited to consult the original 1937 YMCA Press edition {the final volume in *The Collected Works* includes a bibliography}). Where necessary, I have provided a more exact citation to a work (i.e., edition, volume, page, etc.) than that contained in the original. All notes not directly attributed to the author are mine or the editor's.

Transliteration has been done following the usage of the Slavic Review. Generally, Russian Christian names are reproduced here, with

a few exceptions where the name is well known (e. g. Lev rather than Leo, except for Leo Tolstoy).

Square brackets are used very sparingly in the text to enclose material added by the translator. In bringing the translation of Ways of Russian Theology into print, it is a pleasure to thank all those who helped me with the task. First to Richard and Vera Haugh, who checked the translation against the original and who have showed a cheerful helpfulness throughout the work. Also, to Thelma Winter and Mrs. Maryann LoGuidice who patiently typed the manuscript and to Dean William Nelsen and President Sidney Rand of St. Olaf College who provided financial assistance for the typing. Most of all I would like to thank my wife Sharon and my children who often wondered aloud when the job would be done, but never complained when it was not.

ROBERT L. NICHOLS

Saint Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota
June 1, 1978

[1] Many of the biographical and bibliographical facts about Florovsky used here are drawn from Professor George H. Williams' admirable essay, "Georges Vasilievich Florovsky: His American Career (1948-1965)," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. II, No. 1 (Summer, 1965), 7-107. Concerning the quarrel over the book, Williams follows Alexander Schmemann's suggestion (27-28) that the Institute stood polarized at the time between the majority representing the "Russian" school, "who were reworking the major themes of Russian nineteenth-century theology and philosophy," and Florovsky with his "programmatic" return to the Fathers in order to repossess "Christian" or "sacred Hellenism." However, the division between "Hellenists" and "Russians" seems overdrawn, for we are actually dealing with at least two trends in modern Russian theology. One directly continued the themes of the Slavophiles, Vladimir Solov'ev, and the Russian "idea" – the theme of Russia's universalizing response to western humanism. (Florovsky directly challenges this school in the final chapter of the book, where he asks why Russia's culture is punctuated with discontinuities and replies that Russia's "universal responsiveness" is "fatal" and "ambiguous.") The other trend, while by no means indifferent to the first, stressed the need to recover "genuine" Orthodox tradition – a major nineteenth-century theme centering particularly in the Moscow Theological Academy. It would be more correct to speak of two emphases within Russia's recent theological past which continued to grow and flourish even in emigration after 1917 rather than speak of two groups, only one of which dwelled on the major themes of nineteenth-century Russian theology and philosophy. Even Berdiaev, who admonished Florovsky for preferring an abstract and inhuman Byzantinism to Russia's higher spirituality, ends his review by linking Florovsky to nineteenth- century Russian themes. See *Put'*, No. 53 (April-July, 1937), 53-75.

[2] "Role of Honour," (Editorial), *The Living Church* (New York and Milwaukee), Vol. 98, 1 (January 5, 1938), 1 f. as quoted in Williams, op. cit., 38.

CHAPTER VI

PHILOSOPHICAL AWAKENING

CHAPTER VI

PHILOSOPHICAL AWAKENING

I

THE BIRTH OF RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY

Hegel[1] quite eloquently described the process of philosophical awakening. Consciousness proceeds in doubt and travail from the undifferentiated tranquility of the immediate life, the "substantive form of being," transcends everyday cares, and sees the world as an intellectual puzzle or problem. Philosophical birth occurs at a certain time and place. Philosophy does not spring up randomly, but arises among a specific people at a definite moment, and is preceded by a more or less complex set of historical circumstances–a full and lengthy historical experience and trial, which then becomes the object of reflection and meditation. Philosophical life begins as a new mode or stage in the national existence.

Russian consciousness experienced this philosophical birth or awakening, this dissociation of "inner striving" and "outer reality," as the twenties of the nineteenth century yielded to the thirties. Above all, it was a spiritual displacement. A new generation, the "men of the thirites," arrived, and all stood in a state of restlessness and extreme agitation. "Panic intensified thought," Apollon Grigor'ev remarked, "and the disease of moral intensity spread like the plague."[2] The new generation felt disoriented or displaced. Lermontov[3] unforgettably depicted the spiritual conditions and poisonous "reflection" of the time, with its moral-volitional bifurcation of the personality, either as melancholy or sadness; a toxic mixture of daring and despair, disenchantment and curiosity, which produced a voracious desire to escape from the present. Thus from the outset a "critical" element entered into the process of philosophical self-definition. Men of that

restless generation discovered various ways out of an uncongenial present: some escaped to the past, others to the future. Some were prepared to retreat from "culture" into "nature," into the primitive wholeness of a patriarchal and ingenuous past, when life seemed more heroic and earnest (Zhukovskii's[4] "sacred bygone age"). The pastoral setting and "exotic dream" typified the West in that period as well. Others became carried away by premonitions of an inspired, joyous and unheard-of future. Utopianism is the true mark of the epoch.

What is important, however, is precisely that a philosophical pathos emerged in the utopian dreams of those "remarkable decades." Psychological analysis cannot fully exhaust the experience of the time, and any attempt to explain the restlessness in terms of the difficult and onerous socio-political circumstances of the epoch is insufficient. The displacement ran deeper. Still less satisfactory is the contention that the Russians merely imitated western "romantic" fashion. The searchings and struggles of the Russians are too sincere and too genuinely filled with suffering to be a simple imitation or pose. It is true that the age was very impressionistic, and western impressions acted powerfully upon it. But they evoked a creative response. "Books have been and are being translated directly into life, into flesh and blood." Thought awakened. Shpet[5] shrewdly noted that "a certain anarchy arose that was necessary for the soul." As Dostoevskii[6] accurately remarked, it was a moment when "we looked at ourselves consciously for the first time." The puzzles and problems of daily life impetuously ballooned into philosophical questions, making philosophical reflection an irresistible passion. "Oh how poisonously sweet were those ills and torments of the spirit! Oh, the sleepless nights–the nights of feverish thought lasting till the matin bells of dawn!" (Apollon Grigor'ev) Exaltation and doubt became strangely fused into a single poisonous compound. The "great breaking-up of the ice," as Gershenzon[7] aptly dubbed it, began in Russian thought. When later recalling precisely this period, Ivan Kireevskii[8] said "it was a time when the word 'philosophy' had a magical quality." As early as 1830 he openly declared "we must have philosophy, the complete development of our intellect demands it." He also proclaimed that "our philosophy must be derived from our life and be created in response to current questions, to the prevailing attitudes of our public and private existence." Kireevskii proved correct both in his characterization and in his prognosis.

This generation felt irresistibly drawn to philosophy, as if by a kind of passion and craving, as if by a magical attraction exerted through philosophical themes and questions. And while poetry served as the preceding generation's cultural-psychological magnet, a "prose"

period began in literature. Russia's cultural-creative consciousness passed from its poetic phase to its philosophical one. Kireevskii even spoke in those terms: "We sought philosophy in poetry from the very birth of our literature." Russian philosophy was born in those years precisely "from our life," from the dominant current questions and interests. It was born from a historiosophical wonder bordering on fright–part of an unhealthy process of national-historical self-discovery and meditation. And it was born precisely as Russian philosophy, and not only philosophy in Russia. Russian philosophical consciousness awakened–a new people began to philosophize. A new "subject" of philosophy" came into being.

Russian thought roused itself on the basis of German idealism. However, the significance of the reception of German idealism in the creative formation of Russian thought should not be exaggerated. It was precisely an awakening, an outburst, enthusiasm seizing the spirit. One might better speak of a certain sympathetic infection. "Schelling was to the beginning of the nineteenth century what Christopher Columbus was to the fifteenth–he discovered for man an unknown part of his world, about which only fables had existed: his soul."[9] Philosophical systems evoked an entire chorus of echoes in burning souls. An examination of private documents of the period–diaries, letters, and notebooks–reveals the genuine "panic" that seized and excited the human spirit. The needle of a spiritual seismograph quivered and jumped.

The men of that generation did not create their own new systems, and to the detached observer appear to be confused eccentrics. They argued and talked too much, and talked more than they wrote. Very little of all that ferment crystallized in literary form. But nevertheless something very important occurred: thought awakened. A spiritual grafting took place that allowed Russia's cultural creativity to bear fruit for a long time to come. The Russian soul received a philosophical education that subtly suffused nearly all Russian literature and art with a philosophical problematics and restlessness. The Romantic Age began in Russian culture, and not only produced romanticism in literature, but more importantly marked a period of romanticism in life–in the life, of course, of an awakened minority.

II

CREATION OF A THEOLOGICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Philosophy was studied in the Russian "Latin" schools from the seventeenth century, at first according to scholastic textbooks and then from Wolff and Baumeister.[10] A good many books on philosophy have been found in the libraries assembled at that time: in the renowned Arkhangel'skoe library of Prince Dmitrii M. Golitsyn (who even collected manuscripts of translations)[11] and in that of Feofan Prokopovich.[12] Teachers and students, especially in Kiev, read a great deal, sometimes from modern philosophers. Taken as a whole, however, classroom instruction expressed no particular philosophical life of its own and hardly addressed itself to the inner formation of the Russian spirit. Literary-philosophical passions–Voltairianism and freemasonry–proved more important. During Catherine's time much was translated, though it seems for a reader still being sought. Even the works of the "all-wise Plato," translated into the Slavonic-Russian language in the 1780s, were intended for a particular type of reader, even if he was not found. None of this, of course, exceeded the limits of a simple philosophical curiosity, however sincere. No indigenous philosophical anxiety or problematics yet existed.

Only in the Alexandrian era could a more organic and responsible treatment of problems be detected in the philosophical instruction in the reformed ecclesiastical schools. It is true that this instruction was still based on Baumeister or Winkler, and sometimes Carpi.[13] "Although their names, like their profoundly conceived works, were celebrated in our seminaries, they were never celebrated in the scholarly world," Speranskii[14] ironically remarks. Yet the curriculum contained a substantial corrective to this in the form of instruction in the history of philosophy. In the charter of the 1814 school reform[15] the seminaries are urged to familiarize their students with the disagreements among the most renowned philosophers in order to give them "a conception of the true spirit of philosophy" and "to train the pupils themselves for philosophical investigation and acquaint them with the best methods for such study." Acting in the spirit of the charter Filaret of Moscow[16] directed that "during examinations you must see to it that the students answer according to their own thoughts and knowledge and not blindly from their textbooks and notes." Instructors

were told not to give their students notes that were too detailed and overburdened their memories, leaving no room for the independent exercise of their rational faculties. In written assignments or compositions the chief demand was "to reason."

Of course the *Academic Charter* subordinated philosophy to revelation. "Anything not in accord with the true reason of Holy Scripture is in essence falsehood and error and must be mercilessly refuted." But this postulate must be understood in the spirit of the prevailing "theosophism" or pietism. It was more a demand for inner "illumination" or the light of reason than a restriction of independent speculative thought. The charter reminded the philosophy teacher that "he must be inwardly certain that neither he nor his students ever think they see the light of higher, true philosophy unless it be sought in the doctrines of Christianity." This rather encouraged the search for "higher philosophy" in revelation itself (the "philosophy of Jesus," as Fr. I.M. Skvortsov[17] put it). But the charter also recommended Plato as a teacher of "true philosophy," along with his followers in both ancient and modern times. And from the very beginning the greatest influence on academic instruction was modern German metaphysics. The St. Petersburg Academy led the way by producing the first philosophy teachers in the academies in Moscow (Nosov [1814-1815][18] and Kutnevich [1815-1824][19]) and Kiev (Skvortsov [1819-1849]).

Fr. Fedor Golubinskii[20] taught philosophy for many years at the Moscow Academy. Golubinskii's *Weltanschauung* was a unique combination of eighteenth-century pietism and rationalism – "true exaltation of the heart" and "clear rationalism of the mind"–derived from Wolff and Jacobi, as well as Zeiler and Baader.[21] He dearly loved such mystics as Poiret[22] (his system was "like that of a close friend, speaking to the heart and imagination") and Clodius (the "Bernard of the eighteenth century," as contemporaries called him),[23] but he could not sympathize with Böhme or Swedenborg.[24] Among the moderns Schelling pleased him best, but did not at all satisfy him. In his approach to the history of philosophy Golubinskii was closest to Windischmann or even Creuzer, and partly to Degerando.[25] In his courses he elaborated "with special care" works on the philosophy of the ancient Hindus, Chinese, and Zoroaster. He lectured without a strict plan. Nadezhdin[26] remembers his "inspired improvisations," while others speculated that he did not prepare his lectures. Occasionally he would bring an armful of German books to class and translate them aloud. One member of his audience recalls that "he began the first lecture by reading from the books of Solomon."

> For that Christian thinker the favorite topic of intellectual psychology was the doctrine of incorporeal souls and the manner of the human soul's existence when released from the body. He collected ancient legends handed down by adherents of the Talmud and the Kabbala,[27] and tales about clairvoyants and phenomena of the spiritual world from the works of Meyer and Kerner.[28] He translated the latter's novel *Die Seherin von Prevorst* into Russian.[29]

Golubinskii taught German language and literature in addition to philosophy, and greatly enjoyed explaining *Faust* to his students. In any case, he "shaped the souls" of his listeners. "One can hardly imagine the animation, one might say passion for philosophy that then prevailed in the secluded halls of the St. Sergii Monastery," one of the academy students later recalled. "When I entered the academy in 1820 complete translations (in manuscript) of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, Bouterwek's *Esthetics*,[30] Schelling's *Philosophy of Religion*, and others could be found being greedily copied by young men assembled from all corners of boundless Russia." Golubinskii himself engaged in translations, as did to a still greater degree his friend and colleague at the academy Fr. Petr Delitsyn, for many years a professor of mathematics.[31] While still students at the academy they organized the society of "learned discussion," where translations were also undertaken. Already in those years the academy students took an interest in the most recent German systems; "they philosophized, argued, assisted one another in understanding Kant's teaching, toiled over the translation of technical terms in his writings, and critically examined the systems of his disciples." In his youth Delitsyn made translations from both Latin and German—the *Aeneid* (in verse), the *Annals* of Tacitus, and the works of Goethe and Schiller.[32] Later he concentrated exclusively on translating the Greek fathers, above all Gregory of Nyssa.[33] N.I. Nadezhdin taught at the Moscow Academy precisely in those years, and later became a professor at Moscow University and founder and editor of *The Telescope* [*Teleskop*].[34]

According to Rostislavov[35] it was the same at the St. Petersburg Academy when Innokentii Borisov[36] served as its inspector (from 1824 to 1830).

> Let those who studied in the academy at that time recall those lively, heated arguments on philosophical, theological, and other topics that took place among them in their rooms and with their teachers in class. Because of the vehemence and ardor of the antagonists the truth did not always come

> to light, but this same vehemence and ardor showed how greatly the truth interested the disputants. How many students who did not know German learned it in a year, half a year, or even less time simply so they could read German books sooner! No small number toiled and sweated over the works of Kant, Schelling, Herbart, Schad, Krug, Wegscheider, Bretschneider, Rosenmueller, De Wette, Marheineke, etc., etc. . .[37]

The students at the Kiev Academy, where Innokentii was transferred from St. Petersburg as rector, experienced a comparable philosophical awakening during those same years. "The academy must have philosophy in all its strength," wrote Skvortsov to Innokentii. "It is a necessity in our era, and without it the teacher in the Church will be insignificant to his students." One must not, of course, overestimate the degree of consciousness and responsibility to be found in this philosophical animation and study. Many "mastered" the principle of idealism only from others' words during heated discussions and debates. Others merely "leafed through" German books (Pogodin,[38] describing himself). Nevertheless, a philosophical attitude began to take shape. The Russian soul received an education in the spirit of German idealism.

Curiously, the first preachers of philosophical idealism all came from the pre-reform ecclesiastical schools. Vellanskii was a graduate of the Kiev Academy, Galich came out of the Sevsk Seminary, and Pavlov came from the seminary in Voronezh.[39] For a long time after that the ecclesiastical academies supplied philosophy professors for the universities: Archpriest F. Sidonskii and later M.I. Vladislavlev in St. Petersburg;[40] in Moscow P.D. Iurkevich and later M.M. Troitskii (both from the Kiev academy);[41] in Kiev Archimandrite Feofan Avsenev, O. Novitskii and S.S. Gogotskii;[42] and I. Mikhnevich in Odessa at the Lycee Richelieu.[43] It was precisely in the ecclesiastical academies that Russian philosophical thought first responsibly encountered German idealism. Their instruction in philosophy was extensive, and when philosophy as a subject of study (that "rebellious science") was driven out of the universities in 1850, during the ministry of Prince P.A. Shirinskii-Shikhmatov, it eluded the pogroms and repressions of the Nicholaevan era only in the ecclesiastical schools.[44]

During the nineteenth century the academies created their own philosophical traditions. This was especially the case at Moscow Academy, where through 1914 only three men actually taught phi-

losophy: Fr. Fedor Golubinskii (1818-1854), V.D. Kudriavtsev (1854-1891),[45] and Aleksei I. Vvedenskii (1888-1912).[46] They formed a single line of religious idealism, linked above all with Jacobi and also with various shades of idealistic theism from Baader to Lotze. The conditions for philosophical observation and freedom arose and were reflected and felt in a strictly theological context, thus acutely and directly posing the problem of "philosophy and theology" and placing before all the task of "justifying the faith of the fathers" in an integral religio-philosophical worldview. Golubinskii wrote very little, suffering from a lack of will to write. Only much later were his lectures published, and on the basis of undependable and uncorrected student notes. But his study was continued by his disciple and successor Kudriavtsev, whose books are imbued with that style of inner freedom, sublime spirituality, and nobility with which this man of unflinching faith elaborated his speculative justification or grounds for this faith, and constructed his critical synthesis in the midst of the insufficient conclusions of the other philosophical schools. He allotted philosophy the role of a "friendly counselor" in his religious *Weltanschauung.* This serene combination of faithful witness and methodical construction is characteristic of him.

The Kiev Academy developed its own tradition, derived more from Innokentii Borisov than from Skvortsov. Among the outstanding Kiev philosophers stands P.S. Avsenev, later the Archimandrite Feofan. When he was already a professor he became a monk in response to an inner calling. He taught psychology in the academy, chiefly according to Schubert,[47] and in general was close to mystical Schellingianism and Baader, combining this romantic-theosophical mysticism with patristic asceticism (he especially loved Macarius and Issac the Syrian)[48] and also with Plotinus and Plato. He lectured in a bold and inspired manner, dwelling at length on the "nocturnal life" of the soul, on mysterious and magical spiritual phenomena, on dreams, somnambulism, afflictions of the spirit, and "possession, magic, and sorcery." The students of the academy were irresistibly drawn to him, as were the students at Kiev University.[49] In Kiev he was called "the humble philosopher." "His name, as well as that of F.A. Golubinskii, long served as a synonym for philosopher."[50] Avsenev died in Rome as a chaplain at the Russian embassy. V.N. Karpov[51] was a product of the Kievan schools, later becoming a professor at the St. Petersburg Academy. He was famous for his translation of Plato, who served as his introduction to the outlook of the Holy Fathers. This interest in the ancient world was not accidental, for Greek philosophy answered to the spirit of the times. Another Kievan, Karpov's contemporary

O.M. Novitskii, wrote the first Russian language history of ancient philosophy.[52] Written from original sources, the book retains its well-known verve to this day. Later P.D. Iurkevich came to Moscow University from the Kiev Academy. A disciplined thinker, he combined logical precision with mystical inquisitiveness. Vladimir Solov'ev[53] heard his lectures. One should also mention M.I. Karinskii,[54] an alumnus of the Moscow Seminary and Academy and for many years a professor at the St. Petersburg Academy. He was a painstakingly analytical critic of philosophical systems, combining his exacting critical attitude with unswerving faith.

Thus the foundations for systematic philosophical culture were laid in the ecclesiastical schools. But it must be added that philosophical instruction was not limited to the academies, but existed on a broadly conceived plan in the seminaries as well. They alone among the various types of secondary schools possessed a serious, developed philosophical element. "En Russie les hautes écoles ecclesiastiques sont les seuls foyers de l'abstraction," wrote A.S. Sturdza.[55] "Là se reflétent les spiritualismes germaniques." When Stankevich[56] began to study Kant he mused upon the seminarian:

> What a painful situation! You read, reread, rack your brains, and nothing happens! So you drop everything and take a walk. Your head is like a stone, your self-respect is damaged, you find that all your dreams, all your passionate vows, are in vain . . . I began to search for a seminary professor or priest to help me and explain to me what I cannot understand in Kant, especially since it is not a matter of incomprehensibility due to its profundity, but simply because I do not know certain long-recognized psychological facts known to perhaps every ordinary seminarian—while we, men on fire with ideas, go astray and stumble at every step because we did not go through the torments of the schools.[57]

Thus, Russian "love of wisdom" [*liubomudrie*] had its beginning precisely in the ecclesiastical schools. And Russian theological consciousness was molded by this speculative trial and awakened from naive dreams.

III

THE "LOVERS OF WISDOM" AND OTHER MOSCOW "CIRCLES"

The philosophical movement began in Moscow in the 1830s, spreading out from Moscow University. There the preaching of philosophical idealism first acquired the dimensions of a social event, as a new and sensitive generation heard and accepted it. Neither Galich nor Vellanskii found real followers in St. Petersburg, while in Moscow Pavlov aroused a whole generation. "German philosophy found many young, ardent, and conscientious followers, particularly in Moscow," wrote Pushkin in 1836, "and although they spoke a language scarcely comprehensible to the uninitiated, they nevertheless had a wholesome influence that steadily came more to light."[58] The idealist "preaching" [*propoved'*] in Moscow did not, however, originate in the chair of philosophy. Pavlov lectured on physics and agriculture, beginning his courses with a philosophical introduction. Herzen[59] wrote that "Pavlov stood at the doors of the physico-mathematical department and halted the students, questioning them: 'You wish to know nature? But what is nature . . . and what does it mean to know?' " This was an awakening from the slumber of dogmatism.

Pavlov demonstrated in his lectures the insufficiency of "experimentalism" or empiricism in the realm of cognition, and pointed out the constructive necessity of speculation. As one of his listeners put it, he enflamed them with "a passion and zeal for thought" and instilled in them "a critical attitude toward the principles and fundamentals, the development and realization of learning in general." Pavlov expounded a "transcendental philosophy" based on Schelling (in his early period) and Oken.[60] Also exercising considerable influence on the young students was I.I. Davydov (1794-1863), who taught various subjects and at one time was inspector of the university's boarding school. Davydov lacked genuine philosophical views, rapidly shifting from Locke and Condillac[61] to Schelling and accomodating himself to each rather than becoming convinced of their truth. Nevertheless he spread Schelling's ideas. Pogodin subsequently recalled that "Davydov, the boarding school inspector, was a purveyor of Schellingian philosophy to the higher classes. He gave books to the students, discussed the interpretation of the new system with them, and strongly influenced that generation." Some time later N.I. Nadezhdin, as a

professor, critic, and journalist, also added his influence. Stankevich acknowledged that "Nadezhdin's erudition greatly aroused him."

Although the philosophical awakening radiated from the professors, the acquisition of philosophical ideas by the students was not part of the school routine. Those ideas were received and nourished in the unique "circles" into which university youths gathered in those years, particularly in Moscow. These gatherings did not consist of like-minded people. They spent most of their time arguing, and arguing passionately. It was not so much common views that drew them together, but common themes; that intangible "chosen affinity" [*izbiratel'noe srodstvo*] about which they fondly spoke. The members of the various circles felt they belonged to a certain unified higher brotherhood. "We are all knights of the temple," as the young Herzen put it. In the apt phrase of Belinskii[62] they were all "citizens of the realm of speculation."

The "Society of Lovers of Wisdom" [*Obshchestvo liubomudriia*] stood first in the succession of circles. A "secret society," an inner, closed circle of romantic and passionate friendship, its membership included Venevitinov,[63] Prince V.F. Odoevskii,[64] Koshelev,[65] and Ivan Kireevskii. Venevitinov was the heart of the society, and they met in Odoevskii's home. "Here German philosophy reigned—Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Oken, Görres, and others," Koshelev later recalled. Plato should also be added to the list. "A new sun, rising from the land of the ancient Teutons, began to illuminate the infinite sphere of knowledge with the rays of soaring speculation." (Odoevskii) The young lovers of wisdom concentrated their attention on problems of the philosophy of art. In the artist they saw a prophet and authentic creator of life, and through art they awaited the transfiguration and renewal of reality. Two mysteries arrested their thoughts: the mystery of life and the mystery of art. The latter interested them more, and its elusive multidimensional nature also included symbolism. The love of wisdom itself became their new religion; philosophy took on a religious pathos and became a religious substitute. The stamp of romanticism is quite evident in all this. The Moscow Lovers of Wisdom confessed to precisely this philosophical or romantic religion. "To us Christian teaching was appropriate only for the masses of the people, and not for us, the lovers of wisdom," related Koshelev. "We valued Spinoza highly and considered his works much superior to the Gospels and the rest of Holy Scripture" (Spinoza, of course, in a romantic interpretation).[66] But only through renunciation and the act of breaking away could they pass from religious poetics and pietism to positive religion.[67]

A number of that generation belonged to the "outer circle" of the Lovers of Wisdom, including Shevyrev, Pogodin, Kiukhel'beker, and the entire poetry circle around Raich.[68] Polevoi's circle took shape in those same years.[69] It too was under the influence of Schelling (although Polevoi prefered Cousin[70] to Schelling himself) and maintained a romantic outlook. Around 1830 the Stankevich circle and the Herzen-Ogarev[71] circle appeared. Stankevich's circle developed under the direct influence of Pavlov and concentrated on literary and poetic topics, in tandem with the older generation of the Lovers of Wisdom. Fichte's influence was added to Schelling's. Later the philosophical initiative in this circle passed to Bakunin,[72] and a Hegelian current appeared in the 1840s. Herzen's circle also had a romantic outlook. Pavlov's lectures inspired and delighted Herzen, and he also read Cousin. The motifs of Saint-Simonism,[73] "the desire to impart to the world a new religious form" (as Ogarev later said) were fully absorbed into the romantic amalgam. The problematics of "utopian socialism" and German philosophy (as shown by Lorenz von Stein in his renowned book)[74] basically shared the same emotional coloration, the same utopian raptures. Joined by a passionate romantic friendship, Herzen and Ogarev trod the typical romantic path over the next few years.[75] Under the dual influence of romanticism and Saint-Simonism they took up religious themes with increasing poignancy, but within the misty aureole of melancholy dreams--a religiosity of longing and sadness, premonitions and expectations--and both relapsed into Alexandrian mysticism. Herzen caught the infection from Witberg at Viatka,[76] and read Ekhartshausen[77] and other mystics with enthusiasm. Ogarev studied the *Naturphilosophie* of Schelling, Oken, and the theory of animal magnetism.[78] While visiting the Caucasus in 1838 he met the Decembrist A.I. Odoevskii, who gave him a copy of *The Imitation of Christ.*[79] "On my soil, well-prepared by romanticism, the Christian Flower swiftly grew--a sad, pale flower with drooping blossoms, whose pure dew was like tears."[80]

New groups appeared in the 1840s, precisely the period in which the full difference between the "Westerners" and "Slavophiles" was first defined. The debate between them sharpened into a division or split only in the middle of the 1840s. Gershenzon justifiably reminds us that "the key to the history of ideas always lies in the history of emotions." In any event, these "ideas" gained currency through human sensitivity and susceptibility. And in that spiritual milieu religious feelings among the romantic generations were powerful. One needs only to mention the correspondence of Bakunin, the letters of Belinskii in his Moscow years, and the letters of the young Herzen.

The "marvelous decades" were not only filled with ideological disputes, but also marked a decisive phase in the development of religious feelings. "As a whole, the Russian intelligentsia of the thirties was undoubtedly religious." (Sakulin)[81] Romanticism and "idealism" revealed themselves in their duality and ambiguity. It was impossible to remain indefinitely at the crossroads: a choice of paths was inevitable—even lingering implied a choice. The "Westerners" of the 1830s were, in any case, no less occupied with religious problematics than the future "Slavophiles." The conception of socialism of the time was indissolubly linked with a Christian ideology: a quest for an integral worldview.[82] In this regard Bakunin was more typical than others. One should recall that in the 1840s the "Westerners" themselves divided over the religious issue of personal immortality.[83] Belinskii's celebrated letter to Gogol in 1847 acutely reveals the religious character of the "Westerner" attempt at self-definition at a later stage.[84] The entire polemic hinged on the place of religion in the future.

> In your opinion the Russian people are the most religious in the world. But that is a lie. Look more closely and you will perceive that they are by nature a deeply atheistic people. In them there is still much superstition, but no trace of religiosity. . . . Mystical exaltation is foreign to their nature—they have too much common sense and clear-sightedness, too much that is positive in their minds, which thereby perhaps assures them their great historical destiny.

Atheistic prophecy was directly counterposed to religious prophecy. However, atheism itself is an answer to the religious question. The problematics of Feuerbach are no less religious than the problematics of Baader.

The rise of philosophy in the 1830s and 1840s had two consequences. For some a path to the Church, a religious *apokatastasis* of mind and will, was opened. For others the road led to unbelief and even outright struggle against God. This schism or polarization of Russia's cultural elite took place precisely on the religious level. Such a polarization can also be seen in the history of German idealism: Friedrich Schlegel, Görres and Baader on the one hand; Feuerbach and the entire Hegelian "left" on the other. The relationship is not merely a juxtaposition, but one of direct influence and dependence. One must remember that the "Hegelian school" divided precisely on the religious issue.

IV

CHAADAEV AND THE MEN OF THE 1840'S

In the 1840s Russian society visibly divided in debates about Russia. These historiosophic disagreements, however, manifested a deeper and more fundamental difference. There were ample reasons and grounds for reflection on the destiny or calling of Russia during the years after the "international experience" of 1812 and all the military and non-military encounters with Europe. The issue made real by history in the time of Alexander I was that of Russia and Europe. Confrontation thrust itself upon people. In spite of all its weaknesses Karamzin's *History of the Russian State*,[85] that heroic tale or epopee, compelled everyone to feel the reality of the Russian past, and even pre-Petrine history. Romanticism also prompted the debate over the nation's mission: What is the place of Russia in the general plan or scheme of "world history"?

The historiosophic theme of Russia's destiny also became fundamental for the newly awakening philosophical thought in Russia. And on this historiosophical plane the religious question was again posed, with complete clarity, in Russian cultural and social consciousness. The uniqueness of Russia became ever more apparent as, through trial and doubt, it was historically counterposed to "Europe." From the outset the difference was analyzed as a difference in religious destiny. Petr Ia. Chaadaev's fateful "Philosophical Letter" posed the question precisely in this manner.[86]

Chaadaev, a contemporary of the Decembrists, belonged to the previous generation. For all his fondness for convivial society he stood aloof from the idealist debates. His worldview was most fully formed under the influence of French "traditionalism"–Bonald and Ballanche, and to a degree Maistre[87] – and personal ties linked him with the neo-Catholic salons of Paris (those of Circourt and Baron Eckstein,[88] frequented at that time by A.I. Turgenev).[89] Later he also passed under the influence of Schelling, while in his youth Chaadaev went through a period of enthusiasm for Jung-Stilling[90] and other mystics of his type. He was and remained a close friend of A.I. Turgenev and Princess S.S. Meshcherskaia.[91]

Chaadaev is often called the first Westerner, and with him begins the history of Westernism. But he can be called the "first" only in a non-literal use of the term, for everyone of his generation was either

a westerner or often simply a western man. As a Westerner he was unique; his was a religious westernism, whereas Russian Westernism in those years usually led to atheism, "realism," and positivism. To this day Chaadaev remains an enigmatic figure, and his most enigmatic quality is his religiosity. In letters to friends he was rather frank, but even there he remained only a brilliant, witty, and sharp-tongued conversationalist. The reality of the Church is scarcely discernible in the worldview of this apologist of Roman theocracy. He remained a dreamer and loner, like many freemasons and pietists of Alexander I's time.

That he was an ideologist and not an adherent of the Church explains the curious transparency of his historiosophical thought. Christianity itself shrank to the dimensions of a new idea. Properly speaking he was less a thinker than a clever man with rather clearly defined views. One looks in vain for any "system"–he had a principle, but no system. This principle amounted to a postulate for a Christian philosophy of history. For him history is the process of constructing the kingdom of heaven on earth, and only through that process can one enter into or take part in history. This helps to explain the bitterness contained in the "Philosophical Letter." "We belong to none of the great families of the human race," or, to put it another way, "we are among those nations that are not part of humanity." Chaadaev's historical horizon was confined to Western Europe. "Nothing from the experience of Europe has reached us." In this historical isolation he saw a fatal misfortune. He certainly did not identify the cultural isolation or separation of Russia with primitive savagery or simplicity, but only affirmed the non-historicity of Russia's destiny.

Later he was to draw opposite conclusions from the same presuppositions (in *The Apology of a Madman* and in a series of letters). He came to understand that to be reborn in history does not at all mean eternal condemnation to childhood, nor must having only blank pages in the book of the past mean the same will be true in the future. On the contrary, he came to view a rich past as an ambiguity, the "fatal choking of time." He began to believe that the Russian people possessed an incomparable advantage in building the future precisely in their freedom from the western past, "for it is a great advantage to be able to contemplate and judge the world from the highest level of thought, free from savage passions and pitiful avarice." Precisely in the Russians he now saw the "people of God for the future," and moreover believed that a new phase had already started in the history of the kingdom of God. "Political Christianity" must now give way to a "purely spiritual" Christianity.

In his new estimation of Russia's "non-historicity" Chaadaev approximated the Moscow Lovers of Wisdom, above all Odoevskii.[92] Perhaps an encounter with them had influenced Chaadaev. And later Herzen followed in this thought, under Chaadaev's influence. Chaadaev's ideas have their place and significance in the dialectic of Russian historical self-awareness. He critically and acutely evaluated the historical meaning and mission of Christianity. But although he had his own ideas on the philosophy of history, he had no theological ideas or views. By the end of the 1830's he was locked in debates with the younger generation. He brought a good deal to these debates in the very formulation or development of the questions–yet his was a personal influence more than the influence of a definite system of ideas.

The younger generation quickly divided. The very imprecise labels "Slavophilism" and "Westernism" only gave rise to misunderstandings and false explanations. In any case, they do not only or merely represent two historico-political ideologies, but stand for two complete and irreconcilable worldviews and, above all, two cultural-psychological settings. P.G. Vinogradov[93] quite successfully traced the divergence of Westerners and Slavophiles to a "difference of opinion on the understanding of a fundamental principle: culture." But one can go deeper. "Westerners," Vinogradov wrote, "proceeded from an understanding of culture as the conscious creativity of mankind"–immediately explaining the formulation of the question after the Hegelian philosophy of law and society. "The Slavophiles," continued Vinogradov, "were concerned with popular culture, which almost unconsciously grows in the people." Do we not see here the basic thesis of the historical school's opposition to Hegelianism?[94] Of course such a posing of opposites cannot exhaust the entire content of the schism of the 1840s, but its psychological meaning is accurately disclosed. One might formulate it as follows: the Westerners expressed the "critical" and the Slavophiles the "organic" moments of cultural-historical self-definition (for the Slavophile outlines did not sufficiently take into account the motive importance of "negation"). The counterposing of "dialectics" and "evolution" in the social philosophy of the epoch is also revealing.

A new disagreement was also bound up in the problem: should "society" (or the "people") or the "state" be recognized as the ultimate reality in the historical process? Here the traditionalism of the "historical school" unexpectedly joins ranks with socialist radicalism. One can see an analogous affinity or similarity between "uto-

pian socialism" and the French "theocratic school." In the Slavophile attitude there is an evident aftertaste of a certain distinctive anarchism, a hostility toward deliberate interference in the Neptunian course of organic processes, a pathos for the "unnoticeable" and minute alterations forming an aggregate of continuity. Behind this hostility stands a distrust of the solitary or isolated personality.[95] Religion, in the perception of that generation, was recognized above all as a return to wholeness, a gathering of the soul, a deliverance from that burdensome existence of inner desolation and disintegration that had become the affliction of the age. This religious postulate was translated into a historical reality. Escape from the crisis in which all of Europe had been involved throughout its history could only come through a "return," through a new strengthening of social ties, through a restoration of wholeness in life. This was not a case of "archeological liberalism," but the expression of an ingenuous and very lively sense of contemporaneity. Romanticism in general possessed a considerable degree of direct historical sensitivity. After the revolution everyone felt, precisely in social life, the discord and disintegration, the disunion and dissociation of individual ways, of the atomization of life–they felt the excessiveness of "liberty," the fruitlessness of "equality," and the insufficiency of "fraternity." In this connection Saint-Simon's sharp criticisms of contemporary life are particularly instructive. August Comte's entire "positivist" pathos, which was directed precisely against the "negation" of revolution, is also quite characteristic.[96] Both decisively rejected the Reformation as a revolt of the isolated and locked-in personality.

Such very complex and confused historical circumstances nourished a new sensitivity for the conciliar [*sobornaia*] life of the Church. A need and feeling for the reality of the Church [*tserkovnost'*] was awakened and cultivated. In an age of the most severe cultural-historical crisis the Church gained acceptance and recognition as the sole "organic" force amidst the "critical" dissolution and disintegration of all binding ties. Many in the West "returned" to the Church during that age of romanticism for the same reason.[97] However, a fatal ambiguity is concealed in this, which provided a constant source of inner wavering and contradictoriness in the entire romantic religious perception of the world. It is true that the Church is an "ideal society," and only in the Church can the otherwise mutually irresistible tension of human wills be fully resolved. But the "organic" or social motif does not exhaust the reality of the Church, and it must not be taken as primary or basic. Society and the Church are not commensurate.

The Slavophile worldview did not fully discern or admit the incommensurate natures of Church and society. But the failure of the Slavophiles to articulate this did not hurt their theology or their actual teaching on the Church as much as did their philosophy of history, or, more precisely, their philosophy of society. The Church, in their social philosophy, was superseded by the "community" [*obshchina*]–all religious activity was included in the limits of the "community." In that basic and constitutive antithesis of Slavophile social philosophy–Land and State–"Land" replaces the Church! And is not the normal content of Church-state relations entirely absorbed in this new opposition? Strictly speaking, however, in this plan both designations are only conditional. What they actually mean is: worldly construction and inner perfection. In any case, "Land" here is an ethical category. It is enough to recall a few basic definitions provided by Konstantin Aksakov[98] in his famous essay "On the Internal State of Russia" ["O vnutrennem sostoianii Rossii"], presented to Alexander II in 1855:

> The Russian people do not wish to govern...They desire to preserve for themselves not political but internal communal life, their customs, their way of life–the peaceful life of the spirit... Without seeking political freedom, they seek moral freedom, spiritual freedom, communal freedom–the life found within themselves. As perhaps the only Christian people on earth (in the true sense of the word) they remember the words of Christ: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's"; and the other words of Christ: "My kingdom is not of this world." Having thus left the kingdom of this world to the state they, as a Christian people, choose another path: the path to inner freedom and the spirit, the path to the kingdom of Christ. "The kingdom of God is within you."

The life of the "land," or "communal" life, is opposed precisely to the vanity of worldly "concern for governing" [*gosudarstvovaniia*], as a form of existence "not of this world" (the path of inner truth). In this philosophy the "community" is not so much a historical as a suprahistorical or, so to speak, a-historical quantity: the popular element of an ideal non-existence, an unexpected oasis of "another world" that is "not of this world," in which it is both possible and necessary to flee from political cares.

This view is linked with an unexpected contradiction in the way in which Slavophilism poses the philosophical-historical problem. Slavophilism had been conceived as a philosophy of history, a philosophy of universal Christian destiny. But its entire pathos lies precisely in its escape or even retreat from history. The Slavophiles wished to free themselves from a historical or "political" burden and "leave" it to another.

Berdiaev[99] once noted this unexpected discontinuity in Khomiakov's philosophy of history.[100] "He has no prophetic interpretation of history, and one frequently encounters moralizing on history. The ethical prevails over the mystical in his philosophy of history. It contains a religio-moral evaluation but no religio-mystical foresight." As regards the other Slavophiles, one need only repeat this characterization with even greater emphasis. Their ethical maximalism interfered with their ability to sense and discern the day to day problematics of Christian history and life. Hence the pretentious desire to delimit and individuate "State" and "Land" according to a certain principle of "mutual non-interference" or freedom from one another. This amounted to their own version of the "social contract" or a new variant of the ideal society "set apart." The Russian people, says Aksakov, "reserve for themselves a moral-communal freedom, the highest aim of which is a Christian society."

From such statements follows the unexpected naturalism that quite surprises the reader of Khomiakov's *Notes on Universal History* [*Zapiski po vsemirnoi istorii*]. Here the naturalistic factors–freedom and necessity, the "Iranian spirit" and the "Cushite spirit"–are abstractly taken to be the motive forces in history. In this plan Christianity is included as part of the development of the "Iranian" principle while, by contrast, everything false in the Christian West is ascribed to the revolt of the material, non-spiritual "Cushite" principle. There is no need to enter into a more detailed examination or exposition of Slavophile philosophy. All the aporia and discontinuity of the usual romantic worldview, together with a one-sided or exclusively "organic" point of view, are typically repeated and apparent in it. However, Slavophilism is not exhausted by "romanticism." A new and different experiment was begun–an experiment in the reality of the Church. But the Slavophiles did not and could not succeed in synthesizing the reality of the Church and romanticism. Their worldview retained a kind of spiritual "strip-system"[101] or constant counter-currents.

One must always bear in mind the dual origins of Slavophilism. It was a very complex movement. The individual members of the

circle differed from one another in many very perceptible ways. They quarreled a good deal and were frequently in complete disagreement and entirely irreconcilable. These vital differences should not be obscured by some imaginary "common views." Each followed his own course; not all shared the same vital theme. Ivan Kireevskii abandoned the romantics and Schellingianism; Khomiakov never experienced such a stage of the heart; Konstantin Aksakov and Iurii Samarin[102] passed through the acute passion for Hegelianism then spreading throughout Russia.

What is important here is precisely the unrepeatable character of the personalities, the vibrant wholeness of the personal perspectives of each one. Only a certain basic self-perception was held in common: the pathos of "conciliarity" [*sobornost'*]. Least of all can one see in Slavophilism any sort of direct or organic manifestation of the "popular element" (as Gershenzon, in particular, did). Berdiaev's judgment of Slavophilism—"It is this: a psychology and philosophy of aristocratic gardens, of warm cozy nests"—is completely erroneous. In any case, it was the voice of the intelligentsia and not the voice of the people that was heard in Slavophilism. It was the voice of a new cultural system as it passed through the temptation and trial of "Europeanism."

Slavophilism is a reflex action, not the revelation of the primitive. Rozanov[103] rightly said:

> Perhaps the Slavophiles so passionately reached out to touch, understand and prize the native land so highly precisely because they had irretrievably severed any vital ties with it, because they had once believed in the universality of western civilization and with all their gifts and strength not only shouldered the weight of it, but passionately embraced its deepest foundations—which are revealed only to great spirits, but whose embrace never goes unpunished.

Hence Slavophilism's passion for a return to the past and its tension between opposites (a characteristic symptom of the romantic worldview). Apollon Grigor'ev once wrote that "Slavophilism blindly and fanatically believed in an unknown essence of popular life and imposed that belief on itself as a duty." This is too harsh, although it does contain a good deal of truth. Slavophilism is a link in the history of Russian thought, and not merely in the history of the Russian instinct. It was a link in the dialectic of Russian "Europeanism."

V

IVAN KIREEVSKII

Slavophilism was, and aspired to be, a religious philosophy of culture. Only in the context of contemporary cultural-philosophical problematics does it yield to explanation. Slavophiles seriously disagreed with the Westerners over the directions, goals, and possibilities of culture. But none of the "older" Slavophiles had any doubts about the value of culture as such, no matter how powerfully present in them were the motifs of romantic criticism. All saw in the West a "land of holy miracles" (a verse by Khomiakov).

Ivan Kireevskii (1806-1856) was, of course, the most "western" among the older Slavophiles. The name of his first journal, *The European* [*Evropeets*],[104] was most significant. And this was not a mere passing phase. Much later Kireevskii was to emphasize that "the beginnings of Russian learning differ from those of the West only because of their higher level, not because they are utterly dissimilar." He dreamt that western enlightenment might reach the highest level of development–the level of Orthodoxy–and he scarcely had in mind some kind of "reverse motion." "No one, unless he were insane, could think that the memory of all that Russia has received from Europe in the last two hundred years could ever be expunged by force."

Another quite characteristic tie with the spirit of the preceding age of Alexandrian (and Catherinian) mysticism is revealed in Kireevskii's spiritual development. The father of the Kireevskii brothers, Vasilii Ivanovich (1773-1812), a retired "second major" and an active philanthropist, was a convinced Mason who enthusiastically studied chemistry as a "divine science." He invited his close personal friend Lopukhin[105] to be Ivan's godfather. "For the good of his heart" Ivan's grandmother gave the infant a copy of Lopukhin's famous tract on the "inner church." Ivan, however, lost his father early in life and was educated by his mother, who had strong masonic and pietist ties and was connected with Zhukovskii and Batenkov.[106] It was therefore no accident that in his very first essay (1830) he wrote–and wrote with great elan–about Novikov: "for half a century he promoted education among our people."[107] He prepared a separate essay on Novikov, but it was banned by the censors. Kireevskii's mother was a great admirer of French literature, such as *Fénelon*, Massillon, Saint-Pierre, Rousseau, and among the contemporaries Vigny.[108] She

moreover made translations from Jean-Paul and Hoffmann.[109] Kireevskii's step-father, A. A. Elagin,[110] knew and revered German philosophy–Kant and Schelling– and was a friend of Vellanskii's.

Ivan grew up and acquired his education under the triple influence of his mother, his stepfather, and Zhukovskii–in an environment of intense, sentimental pietism. In his worldview there was always a layer of dreamy melancholy, the seal of "holy melancholy," in the contemporary phrase. At a quite early age he read not only Locke, but Helvetius as well.[111] Later he read Locke again. "We read Locke together," Koshelev recalled about their adolescence. "The simplicity and clarity of his exposition enchanted us." At about the same age Kireevskii had a fervent interest in political economy and wrote a treatise *On Virtue* [*O dobrodeteli*]. This study was apparently related to his reading of Scottish philosophers such as Dugald Stewart, Thomas Reid, Adam Ferguson, and Adam Smith, who were constantly recommended by Zhukovskii.[112] "Their light illuminates life and enlivens the soul." (However he also read the transcendental Schelling, toward whom Zhukovskii felt an insurmountable distrust.) One might note that interest in the Scottish philosophers of "public feeling" was characteristic in France during the First Empire, and there was this French motif in Kireevskii's development. Yet his enthusiasm for German "love of wisdom" [*liubomudrie*] already overshadowed it.

Koshelev emphasizes that during this period of passionate youthful Schellingianism Ivan Kireevskii remained "entirely indifferent to the Christian worldview." He entered (as opposed to "returned to") faith and the Church only later, after his marriage, under the influence of his wife and her confessor, whom she introduced to him, the famous monk of the Novospasskii Monastery Father Filaret.[113] The elder Makarii of the Optina hermitage[114] later added his influence. It is true that Kireevskii began to talk about "religion" quite early, and during his trip abroad he thoughtfully and attentively took in Schleiermacher's lectures on theology.[115] As early as 1827 he dreamt that "we restore the right of true religion, reconcile the exquisite with morality, and awaken the love of truth." However, at that time religion largely remained for him a romantic and philosophical postulate or symbol. A long hard road lay between these pathetic and dreamy pronouncements and genuine faith.

For Kireevskii the road proved difficult. Koshelev's brief "History of the Conversion of Ivan Vasil'evich," written on the basis of the recollections of N.P. Kireevskii, is highly characteristic. "Immediately after his marriage his wife's fulfillment of our liturgical rites and customs affected him unpleasantly... She, for her part, was even more pain-

fully hurt by his lack of faith and complete disdain for all the customs of the Orthodox Church." At that time he was reading Cousin and Schelling, and he proposed to his wife that they read them together. "When great, luminous thoughts arrested him and he demanded astonishment from his wife, she straightaway replied that those ideas were already familiar to her from the works of the Holy Fathers." Kireevskii occasionally tried to condition himself to read patristic books, but "it was unpleasant for him to admit that the fathers contained a good deal that had captivated him in Schelling." He had been educated in a vague, moralistic dreaminess, and although he was long agitated by the heart, that inclination and feeling still did not constitute faith. Romantic religiosity in general was only a sentiment—a presentiment of and thirst for faith, but not yet faith.

It is interesting to compare the paths of Ivan Kireevskii and V. F. Odoevskii. Their basic premises and stages coincide, yet Odoevskii never escaped from the closed circle of romanticism. In the thirties, of course, he was completely immersed in the mysticism of Saint-Martin and Pordage[116] (again a characteristic vestige of the Alexandrian era), but he found no genuine religious release in this theosophical and alchemical mysticism. Odoevskii did not exceed the limits of a dreamy, intellectual speculation. In the 1840s he sank into a form of sentimental naturalism (then called "realism"). Only by the strength of "religious abnegation" and in the experience of faith was Kireevskii able to move beyond this constricting circle. Kireevskii and Odoevskii provide an interesting comparison in yet another respect. Before each of them stood the same question: what is the place of Russia in Europe? As early as the 1820s they expressed presentiments and prophecies about the historical mission of Russia. On the basis of the crisis, the "universal torpor," in which they saw the old nations of Europe, they sensed that the West had been exhausted and its creative power evaporated. Kireevskii deduced that it was precisely Russia that was destined to become the heart of Europe in a near, already unfolding, epoch. Odoevskii explicitly predicted the inward and spiritual "Russian conquest of Europe." "As somnambulists await the mesmerist, so the Europeans await the approach of the Russian mind."

It might be asked how the "Russian mind" might be introduced into the harmonious creativity of culture. Odoevskii proposed that a "science of instinct" be created, a "theosophical physics," which could give the principles of a new Schellingian philosophy the greatest practical application. In other words he meant to make romanticism manifest in life. In the 1830s Kireevskii thought in the same way.

A very expressive note was struck by the title of his fateful essay in *The European,* "The Nineteenth Century." His stress fell precisely on a contrast between the nineteenth and the destructive eighteenth century. The development of thought is being fulfilled only negatively, and to a positive era a "demand" [*trebovanie*] is foretold–"the demand for a great fusion of Religion with the life of peoples and nations." This should be compared with Odoevskii's article "The Nineteenth Century Belongs to Russia." Everything is rather vague in these pathetic premonitions. The entire scheme was constructed without taking into account the reality of the Church. At that time Kireevskii saw Russia's uniqueness more as a negative symptom: "the ancient world was lacking in our development."[117] With this symptom he linked another consideration. "In Russia the Christian religion was yet purer and holier. But the influence of our Church, which was for a time uneducated, did not prove as decisive or all-powerful as that of the Church of Rome because of the deficiency of the classical world." On the other hand, Kireevskii subsequently detected in "classicism" the foundation and root of western rationalism, of that dominant "pure naked reason, which has as a basis only itself and which refuses to acknowledge anything higher or outside itself."

For Kireevskii the entire meaning of western falseness is revealed in the triumph of formal reason or rationality over faith and tradition, by the elevation of the deduction over tradition. Thus, he sees the entire meaning of Russia's uniqueness in tradition. Let ancient Russia be poorly developed, for she possesses the conditions for proper future development that were not granted to the West. "That constructive principle of knowledge, that philosophy of Christianity, which alone might give a proper foundation to the sciences, was collected and lived in her." Kireevskii was thinking of unbroken patristic tradition. Least of all did he wish for a return in time or for the restoration of ancient forms–any restoration of dead forms is both ridiculous and harmful. Only the "inner construction of the spirit" mattered. He always spoke about a passage to a "higher plane." During his romantic period he had no doubt that this higher plane belonged to the unbroken line of western development, but now he began to have doubts. "The foundations of western learning, which has been continuously developed throughout the history of the West, have been proven unsatisfactory for the high demands of enlightenment in our time."

The crisis of European enlightenment can only be resolved when a "new principle" is accepted and established: "that heretofore unnoticed principle of life, thought and learning that lies at the foundation of the Orthodox-Slavic world." Western philosophy leads to

the awareness that "new principles" are essential for further development (Kireevskii has in mind here Schelling and, perhaps, Baader), but it cannot go beyond demands or presentiments. Kireevskii attached no decisive importance to natural or innate qualities in people; the higher "principle" of Orthodox truth–wholeness and reasonableness–defined his evaluation of Russian history and the outlook of the Russian people. It was precisely the patristic tradition that he valued and loved in the East.

> Once pulled from beneath the knout of the rational systems of European philosophy, the educated Russian will find, in the depths of that special, vital, integral, and inaccessible to western understanding worldview of the Holy Fathers of the Church, the most complete answers to those very questions that most agitate a soul deceived by the final results of western self-awareness.

Kireevskii was a man of a single theme, if not a single thought. He constantly returns to one and the same theme: "On the Character of European Enlightenment and its Relation to Enlightenment in Russia," the title of his famous and generally characteristic essay in *Moscow Miscellany* [*Moskovskii Sbornik*] in 1852.[118] As earlier, the question before him concerns the future. He does not sound the call to a chronological return, but to an entry into the depth of the Church. He least of all wished for a simple restoration of customs–he is wholly engaged in the pathos of construction and creation, in the spirit of the Church's fulness. Any "reverence for tradition" that clings more to external appearances than to the inner spirit he denounces as completely dangerous. Kireevskii does not understand a return to the fathers as a mere repetition or imitation. Following is not the same as repeating. And he was constantly explaining this point.

> The love of wisdom of the fathers represents only the embryo of this future philosophy... For philosophy is not a fundamental conviction, but an intellectual development of that relationship which exists between this fundamental conviction and contemporary learning... To think that we have a ready-made philosophy contained in the Holy Fathers would be a great mistake. Our philosophy must still be created, and not just by a single person. It must take form through the sympathetic cooperation of a common mind.

These are very characteristic reservations for him. In the first place, he did not expect to find "ready answers" among the fathers–it was more important to grasp the patristic method of knowing or searching, and then search. "They spoke of the country in which they lived." Secondly, all the questions of western culture must be acknowledged and resolved, not avoided. "All of the fruit of a millenium of the experiences of reason amidst its multifaceted activities" must be considered. He sees the task of future Orthodox enlightenment not in excluding reason, but in surmounting it.

Kireevskii was very reserved toward contemporary Russian theologians. He condemned Makarii's *Introduction* [*Vvedenie*][119] for its "arid schoolman's style" and he noted opinions that were out of harmony with the Russian Church: "for example, on the infallibility of the hierarchy, as the Holy Spirit appears to the hierarchy separately, in disjunction from the whole body of Christianity." His opinion of Antonii Amfiteatrov's book on dogmatics[120] was no better. "To be truthful, we have no satisfactory theology," he wrote to Koshelev. The sermons of Filaret[121] served as a better "introduction" for him ("they contain many brilliant gems that should lie at the foundation of the fortress of Zion"), as did the *Spiritual Alphabet* [*Dukhovnyi Alfavit*], published in a collection of the writings of St. Dimitrii of Rostov,[122] and the works of Tikhon Zadonskii.[123] Later in life Kireevskii participated with great enthusiasm in the publication of patristic (primarily ascetical) writings undertaken at the Optina hermitage. He was buried at Optina.

Kireevskii characteristically combined inner freedom with the strictest obedience. He fully subordinated his philosophical and theological enterprises to the judgment of the elder Makarii of Optina. His statements about the freedom of thought in Orthodoxy are spoken with great conviction. "Our Church never set forth any human system, any learned theology, as the foundation of her truth, and therefore did not forbid the free development of thought in other systems or persecute them as dangerous enemies who might shake her foundation." In his personal views he achieved that synthesis about which he spoke. For him "all questions of contemporary learning" had to be "considered" within the spirit of patristic tradition. Kireevskii wrote little–only a few programmatic essays. But in these one immediately detects the wholeness and integrity of his thought, character and personality. From one standpoint he might seem an unsuccessful, subdued and superfluous man, and in reality his social activity did not meet with success. Yet by passing through a period of inner construction he became self-contained, and through an ascetic effort, not

through disillusionment. His thought gained strength and temper behind this inner floodgate. "The will is born in secret and raised in silence." Least of all can Kireevskii's path be termed organic. It was a path of ascetic effort. The wholeness of spirit about which he wrote was not the innate immediacy of the romantics.

Kireevskii lived through conversion and renunciation. "In any case, the method of the thinking believer is not the same as that of one who seeks convictions or who leans upon abstract convictions." This was not "inclusion in the Church" [*votserkovlenie*], but the overcoming of romanticism.

VI

N. V. GOGOL

In those years the religious problematics of culture were sensed with particular acuteness by Gogol.[124] It is difficult to differentiate between his artistic path and his personal fate, but at any rate Gogol occupies a highly distinctive place among his younger and older contemporaries. As a writer he was both progressive and backwards. New directions proceed from him, and not just in literature. His creative work possesses a prophetic quality. But still he himself remains a part of the preceding age. His spiritual backwardness or archaism is one of the links in his tragic fate.

The philosophical trends of the epoch did not affect Gogol, except through art. The "debates" of his contemporaries, all those "quarrels over our European and Slavic principles" between the "old believers" and the "new believers," or Slavicists and Europeanists, seemed to him to be a complete misunderstanding. "They all speak about various sides of the same thing, never guessing that they are arguing over nothing and repeating nothing to each other." Gogol mixed more frequently in the company of Slavophiles, but he personally was not one of them. With greater accuracy he might be considered a Westerner. But he did not love the same West, nor did he feel the same kind of love for it, as contemporary Russian Westerners did. Still, his worldview and spiritual temperament made him entirely a part of the West. Early in life he fell under western influence and he remained there. In reality the West was all he knew—about Russia he largely dreamed. Gogol knew more about what Russia should be and what he wished to see in it than what Russia actually was.

In his youth Gogol experienced the ordeal of German romanticism and found it congenial to work in the romantic spirit. He mastered the creative problematics of romanticism in a manner neither imitative nor solely literary, intimately inserting himself into the romantic experiment. This was an important stage or revolution in his inner life. With a creative seriousness he lived through and deeply felt all the demonological motifs of the romantics and reincarnated them in images pregnant with meaning. One feels the power of his personal conviction and the sharpness of his personal experience–the world lies in the power of evil forces, dark obsessions, and wickedness. Hence his early awakened religious fear–an outright phobia, and not just trembling or reverence. The young Gogol lived his religious life in a peculiarly magical, bewitched and enchanted world, full of strange visions into the mysteries of dark passions. A "mortifying insensitivity for life" was subsequently unveiled before him. He perfectly depicted arrested, congealed, immobile faces–not quite faces but masks. (Rozanov observed that a portrait by Gogol is always static.) It has been correctly noted that he saw the world beneath the sign of death, *sub specie mortis.*

Romanticism also supplied his first utopian temptation: the temptation of the creative power of art–and then his first disillusionment: art turns out to be ambiguous, and therefore impotent. "Magical idealism" is seductively two-faced.

> You would be amazed, my son, at the terrible might of the devil. He strives to penetrate everything: our work, our thoughts, and even the very inspiration of the artist. Innumerable will be the sacrifices for this infernal spirit that dwells invisibly, without form, on earth. This is the dark spirit that breaks in on us even during moments of the purest and holiest meditation.

Gogol retained this fear throughout his life, right down to the prayers on the eve of his death. "Bind Satan once again with the mysterious power of your inscrutable cross."

The romantic experiment is always formed amidst antitheses and tensions: spontaneity and reflection, "conciliarity" and individual will, reconciliation and protest, peace and anxiety. Romanticism is entirely immersed in this dialectical game. In Russian romanticism the theme of reconciliation is more strongly expressed; "organic" motifs predominate over "critical" ones. To the extent that it was a romantic phenomenon one must say that this was especially the case with Sla-

vophilism. Only a few voiced anxiety, only a few were granted an apocalyptical ear with which to listen. Lermontov was one such person, and his creative work is all the more enigmatic for not being completed. This apocalyptical hearing also operated with special strength in Gogol.

Romanticism alone offers no religious outlet. A return to the Church along the path of "religious renunciation" is necessary, for in itself romanticism is only an imaginary or false path. The young Gogol had a quite diffuse religious worldview composed of a very vague religious humanism, romantic agitation, and sensitivity or feeling. Except esthetically, he felt no reality in the Church at that time. "I came to Christ more by a Protestant route than by a Catholic one," he later wrote to Shevyrev.[125] "An analysis of the human soul in a manner no one else has made explains why I encountered Christ, being at first amazed by his human wisdom and previously unheard-of knowledge of the soul, and then bowing down before his divinity." Or again in *An Author's Confession:*

> Since then man and his soul have become more than ever the subject of observation... I turned my attention to the discovery of the eternal laws by which each man and mankind in general move. The books of lawgivers, of those who know the soul, of those who observe human nature, became my reading. I was occupied with everything–wherever knowledge of men and their souls found expression, from the witness of the layman to the confession of the anchorite and hermit. Insensibly, almost without knowing how, I journeyed along this road and came to Christ. And I saw in him the key to the human soul and realized that none who knew the soul had reached the pinnacle of spiritual understanding on which he stood.

The admission is quite characteristic: Gogol traveled on the path of pietist humanism. Thus he remained a part of the Alexandrian age. Precisely speaking, he did not just read the books of "those who know the soul" and "those who study the soul," but labored over them. In any case, he read the Bible and became accustomed to reading it as a prophetic and apocalyptical book. Even his style became affected by Biblical solemnity.

> Open the book of the Old Testament. There you will find every contemporary event, you will see clearly the day upon which that event transgressed in the sight of God,

> and how his terrible judgment was expressed upon it so plainly that the present will tremble.

This was spoken in connection with the lyricism of Russian poetry, in which he detected something prophetic. "The cadence of our poets is biblical," for a "new kingdom" is already approaching for Russia.

The impressions of his Roman period proved decisive in Gogol's spiritual development. "I gathered and stored in my soul all that I needed. Rome, as a holy place, as a witness of wondrous things, acts upon me and dwells in me eternally." Whether Princess Zinaida Volkonskaia and the Polish brothers of the Order of the Resurrection did or did not try to turn Gogol toward Catholicism is beside the point.[126] Gogol never considered "changing the rites of his religion," simply because at the time he saw no differences among confessions.

> Since both our religion and Catholicism are entirely one and the same, there is absolutely no reason to exchange one for the other. Each is true, each acknowledges one and the same Savior, one and the same Divine Wisdom, which once visited our earth and for its sake endured the ultimate humiliation, in order to raise the soul and direct it toward heaven.

From his Roman conversationalists he learned about more than Roman Catholic dogma. He also heard about "Slavic affairs." Gogol met Mickiewicz.[127] And one must suppose that the Polish brothers told Gogol about the work of their congregation or order, and about Polish messianism–that aroused "apostolate of truth," or program of religious action.

This was Gogol's first introduction into the realm of contemporary social Christianity. Esthetic experiences cannot fully account for these years in Gogol's religious experiment. In his consciousness social motifs are also quite boldly pronounced–a fully understandable development given the historical background. Characteristic in this connection is Gogol's "Rome": "A frightful kingdom of words instead of deeds." Its universal desolation derives from unbelief. "The holy images were carried from the cathedral and the cathedral was a cathedral no more. Bats and evil spirits dwell in it." But on the other hand there is a hint of the ideal of religious recovery. Gogol's intimate friends (the Vielgorskiis, Smirnova, and others) were connected with Catholic circles in Paris.[128] Smirnova was captivated by the sermons of

Lacordaire and Ravignan,[129] and in the 1830s she joined the Svechina circle.[130] This was a new source of contact with social Catholicism. While in Rome Gogol quite likely read Silvio Pelliko's *On the Duties of Man* [*Dei doveri degli uomini*], which had been sympathetically noted in Russian journals.[131] A note was quite enough for Gogol. His genial impressionability quickly seized upon these hints and created from them an agreeable legend. After all, he was a poet. One should remember that the priest introduced in the last, destroyed version of *Dead Souls* strangely combines the personal traits of Father Matvei "with Catholic overtones."[132] This illustrates the strength of Gogol's "Catholic" influences.

During his Rome years the famous *Imitation of Christ* became a basic component in Gogol's spiritual makeup.[133] He sent copies to friends in Moscow for daily reading and meditation.

> After reading it through, give yourself over to contemplation of that which you have read. Turn it over on every side until you discover and perceive exactly how it might be applied to you.

Obviously, Gogol himself proceeded in this manner. "Choose a free and convenient hour for this spiritual occupation, which can serve as the foundation of your day. Immediately after coffee or tea would be best, so that your appetite will not deflect you." He advised Smirnova to read through passages from Bossuet's *Oeuvres Philosophique*,[134] and also asked her to "seek out Thomas Aquinas' *Somma teologica*, if it has been translated into French."[135]

Simultaneously he was reading the Russian translations of the Holy Fathers in *Christian Reading* and in the Moscow *Supplements*.[136] It is curious, however, that while working on his *Meditations on the Divine Liturgy* in Paris in 1842 and 1843 he was using not only the Slavic text, but also the Latin text by Goar,[137] obviously in place of the Greek. The famous book by Dmitrievskii[138] served as his basis for exegesis. Gogol also asked to be sent the *Areopagitica*.[139] These details are all very revealing. Gogol's style was formed in a western manner, and by the time he read the holy fathers his spiritual habits had already been established. Patristic motifs were merely sewn into a previously woven fabric. At that time he was also reading Chrysostom, Ephrem the Syrian, St. Maxim's *On Love*, the entire *Philokalia* (in Paisii's translation), and St. Tikhon Zadonskii (see his extracts from the holy fathers).[140] It is not clear why he asked to be sent the sermons of Stefan Iavorskii, *The Trumpets of Words* [*Truby sloves*]

and *The Spiritual Sword* [*Mech dukhovnyi*] by Lazar Baranovich, and Dimitrii of Rostov's *The Search* [*Rozysk*],[141] nor is it clear if he even received them. Among contemporary Russian authors he read the sermons of Innokentii and Iakov Vecherkov[142] and the anonymous articles in *Christian Reading*.

From his youth Gogol was firmly convinced that he had been chosen, called and predestined–his existence meant something, he was to accomplish some great or special deed. This kind of self-perception characterized that whole generation, and even the entire sentimental-romantic era. It was a very complex alloy. In time his sense of destiny became an obsession, the seduction of pride. "An invisible person writes before me with a mighty scepter." He was convinced that he had been summoned to testify and to teach. "Henceforth a higher power invested my word." Persuaded of the special meaning of his personal experience and example, he justified himself against critics by exhibiting his inner self and reminding them that "nonetheless, I am not a monk, but a writer." He added further that "I did not believe that I would tempt anyone by publicly revealing that I aspire to be better than I am, I find no harm in acknowledging before everyone a thirst to be enflamed with a desire for perfection."

Gogol had a very dangerous theory of prayer:

> How does one apprehend God's will? One must peer with penetrating eyes into oneself and search oneself. Which of our abilities given from birth are higher and more noble than others? With these abilities we must first of all labor, for such labor constitutes God's desire–otherwise they not be granted us. Thus, by asking that these abilities be awakened, we are asking for that which is in accord with His will, and therefore our prayer will be heard directly. Prayer must come from all the powers of our souls. If such unremitting intensity is observed for only two minutes a day, after a week or two you will unfailingly see its effect. And toward the end of that time in prayer further things will become apparent... Then answers to questions will flow directly from God, and their beauty will be such that your entire being will be rapturously transfigured.

Obviously, Gogol himself practiced such prayer. Thus it is hardly suprising if he attached an almost sinless quality to his writings and

saw a higher revelation in them. His persistent didacticism and outright insolence, however, greatly irritated his closest friends. There is a strange excessiveness in the way he chose his words and turned a phrase when speaking about himself and his work. "Compatriots, I loved you–and I loved you with that inexpressible love, which was given to me by God."

Gogol had a difficult religious path, one whose twists and fractures have necer been explained and are hardly explicable. He would frequently break out in convulsions of religious fright. Terrible visions would suddenly appear before his gaze and he would inwardly faint. "Without masks the devil stalks the world." Such is his terrible vision! "The entire dying structure groans. O, those gigantic growths and fruits, the seeds of which we have sown in life without foreseeing or detecting the frightening things that would arise from them." Gogol's experience undoubtedly contained some of the qualities of an ascetical anguish, an unhealthy and excessively intense penitential reflex. But his uniqueness lies precisely in his combination of this acute asceticism with a very insistent will for social action.

Therein lies the entire meaning of his fatal book *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. As Gogol himself insists in *An Author's Confession*, he wished "to speak out on some of the things I had to prove in the persons of the heroes discovered in the narrative work" (that is, in the second part of *Dead Souls*). Quite characteristic is the expression "to prove." He consciously converted his artistic images into proofs. In the second part of *Dead Souls* Gogol wanted to depict Russia "reborn" or awakened. As he conceived it, it was certainly not intended to be a story, but precisely a "poem." It was to be "a poem beneficial for the soul," and the *Selected Passages* is the ideological preface to that "poem." Only by an extreme misunderstanding is it possible to view the book as a sermon for personal perfection and salvation. In reality it was a program of social Christianity. Gershenzon was apparently the first to recognize that fact.[143] "Perhaps no other work in the Russian language is so wholeheartedly and completely, down to the finest nuances of thought and word, suffused with a social spirit." He also rightly noted the unexpected way in which Gogol combined moral pathos with the most extreme and minute utilitarianism. "Aimless joy for living did not exist for Gogol... His thought is thoroughly practical and utilitarian, precisely in a social sense." Gogol's basic category is to be in service [*sluzhba*], never merely serving [*sluzhenie*].

> No, for you, just as for me, the doors of the long awaited cloister are locked. Your monastery is Russia! Array your

> thoughts in monastic garb and completely mortify yourself—but only for yourself, not for her. Step forth and give yourself up to her. She now summons her sons more loudly than ever. Already her soul aches and she cries out from her spiritual illness.

Still less could Gogol find contemporary life satisfactory; still less could he be content with the existing order and arrangement. He was entirely possessed by a pathos for renovation, he had a kind of apocalyptical impatience, a thirst for immediate action. "The earth is already on fire with an incomprehensible anguish." Precisely because he felt so disturbed over Russia's existing condition he insisted that "whoever is not serving must enter service and seize upon his duty, even as a drowning man grabs a plank, for otherwise you can save no one." Gogol's book is concerned from beginning to end with social welfare—it is a utopia of the holy tsardom.

> Each of us on the ship must now carry out his duty, his service, that we might steer ourselves away from the whirlpool, gazing always at the Heavenly Helmsman. Each of us must now serve not as we served in the former Russia, but as in the new heavenly kingdom, whose head is Christ himself.

The expression "former Russia" is also characteristic. Gogol came to see himself as part of "another world," as existing on a new, theocratic level. Is this perception of himself not in accord with the spirit of the "Holy Alliance"[144] and with the ideology of the Alexandrian era and the "Combined Ministry"?[145] The image of the governor-general in the second part of *Dead Souls* was entirely sustained in that style:

> Beginning tomorrow I will furnish a copy of the Bible to all the departments in the provincial bureau, and in addition three or four of the classics, a copy of each Russian chronicle, the foremost world poets, and the faithful chronicles of our life.

Moreover, the fact that Gogol's religio-social utopia allows the state to overshadow the Church and give creative initiative to laymen as their "service," rather than to the hierarchy or the clergy, also ties him to the Alexandrian spirit. "The sovereign's authority would be a

senseless phenomenon if he did not feel that he must be God's image on earth." The entire Bible turns out to be a book for kings, who must merely imitate God and rule as he ruled the chosen people. A king is called to be "the image on earth of him who is himself love." Everything throughout the world has become terrible, so much suffering exists "that even the unfeeling heart is ready to burst with compassion, and the power of commiseration, which did not exist before, evokes the power of love, which also previously did not exist." Gogol predicts that in some unprecedented way the heart will become enflamed.

> Men will burn with a love for all mankind such as has never before burned within them. As separate individuals we cannot make the full force of love real—it remains in the realm of thoughts and ideas, not deeds. It can be made real only in those in whom the commandment to love all others as one has been firmly rooted. By loving everyone in his kingdom, every single individual of every class and calling... by making them, as it were, all a part of his own body... by feeling for them with all his soul... by grieving, wailing, praying day and night for them, the sovereign acquires that omnipotent voice of love that alone can speak to a sick humanity.

As early as 1826 A.A. Ivanov[146] sketched a very similar utopian image of the theocratic tsar. But still more curious is the later echo of this same ideal in Vladimir Solov'ev's meditations on the Russian tsar's theocratic obligations: to forgive and to heal with love. This is a single stream of thought and temperament whose source can be traced back to the time of the Holy Alliance.

Gogol speaks about the great religious and historical advantages of the Eastern Church: "Our Church reconciles and resolves everything." The Eastern Church is the Church of the future, which "contains the road or the way by which everything in man will be joined in one harmonious hymn to the Supreme Being." The Western Church is not prepared for new historical tasks. In previous times it could somehow "reconcile with Christ" a one-sided and incompletely developed humanity, but now the tasks are immeasurably more complex. However, once again Gogol defines the historical mission of the Russian Church from a civil point of view.

> An unheard-of miracle can be accomplished before all Europe by compelling each class, calling, and rank among

> us to reach their legal limits and, without altering a thing in the state, give Russia the power to thereby amaze the entire world with the harmonious structure of that same organism that heretofore had frightened it.

Until now the Church had somehow hid herself "like a chaste maiden," but she was created to bear life.

How characteristic are Gogol's injunctions "to the wife of a provincial governor" and "to a Russian landowner" to take it upon themselves to guide priests. "Frequently reveal to them those terrible truths before which their souls unwillingly tremble."

> Take the priest everywhere, wherever you are working. Let him be with you always, as an assistant... Take up the writings of Chrysostom and read him together with your priest, with a pencil in hand...

Again, all of this is fully in keeping with the spirit of the "Combined Ministry." It is therefore not suprising that only people of the Alexandrian spirit and style liked Gogol's book, people such as Smirnova ("My soul has been enlightened by you") and Sturdza ("Our conversations in Rome are reflected as in a mirror"). Father Matvei, Ignatii Brianchaninov, Grigorii Postnikov, and Innokentii all categorically detested it.[147] In upbraiding Gogol for "pride" they meant precisely his spirit of utopian activism, and not without grounds did the Aksakovs see a western influence and evil in the book. It has also been rightly noted that the book contains more morality and moralism than actual faith or sense of the Church. The *Inspector General* is written in the same style, with its moralistic allegories ("our spiritual city," "the treasury of our souls," etc.).

Gogol always remained within the circle of a rather vague pietism, and his book on the liturgy does not constitute an exception to this statement. The dogmatic content and symbolism are both borrowed from Dmitrievskii, and, in part, from the *New Table of Commandments* [*Novaia skrizhal'*].[148] Gogol contributed only its style of moving and sincere sensitivity. "The Divine Liturgy is an eternal repetition of the great act [*podvig*] accomplished for our sake... The gentle kiss of a brother can be heard..." Characteristically, at the time he wrote the *Selected Passages* Gogol always and everywhere emphasized the psychological significance of the image of Christ, "who alone among all who have ever lived on earth revealed in himself a complete knowledge of the human soul."

There is yet another current in the *Selected Passages*: a current of authentic "social Christianity," which most forcibly comes out in the famous fragment "Bright Easter" ["Svetloe Voskresenie"]: "Christians! They drove Christ into the street, among the lepers and the sick, instead of inviting him into their home, under their roofs–and they think they are Christians!"[149] The stress on the diminution of brotherhood in the nineteenth century is also characteristic. "The poor man of the nineteenth century has forgotten that on this day none are base or contemptible, but all are brothers of the same family, all bear no name but brother." The models of the Westerners are more readily recalled here than those of the Slavophiles (although Gogol does remark that "the foundation of the brotherhood of Christ exists in our Slavic nature," among similar statements). One clearly hears the echoes of Lammenais and his *Paroles d'un Croyant.*[150] And Gogol's characterizations of the requirements and needs of "the nineteenth century" are quite typical:

> When the embrace of all mankind as brothers becomes the cherished dream of the young... when many dream only of how to transfigure all mankind... when nearly half have solemnly acknowledged that Christianity alone has the power to bring this about... when they have begun to say that everything will be in common, both homes and lands . . .

Gogol speaks about "brotherhood" in this wide frame of reference, lamenting that this feeling for a vital fraternity had not been grasped. Meanwhile, only by loving one's neighbor can one love God. "It is difficult to love him whom no one has seen. Christ alone brought and announced to us the mystery that by brotherly love we receive love for God... Go into the world and first acquire love for your brothers." Full force falls on the word "first." This single word is placed under pathetic stress.

Quite diverse strands are crisscrossed and interwoven in Gogol's book, and there is no complete unity in it. However, his social concern and the direction of his will remain unaltered. The book's design itself represented a fatal discrepancy. He tried to bring everything to bear on the "spiritual task." "My task is the soul and the enduring labor of life." But the fact that he was least of all a psychologist and unable to acquire a psychological foundation is another element in the plot of his creative drama. Instead of psychological analysis one gets reasoning and arid moralizing. Apollon Grigor'ev rightly emphasized that Gogol is entirely a man of action.

In *An Author's Confession* Gogol explains that *Selected Passages* is "The confession of a man who spent several years inside himself." Yet his inner experiment was confused and constituted his chief weakness. This fact is linked to the "religious crisis" of his last years. Gogol's only way out lay in the renunciation of his social utopia and in a genuine ascetical entry inside himself. "Turn about in your inner life," Father Matvei advised him. Later in life Gogol underwent an inner change that weighed heavily on him. But he could not undergo any change in his creative work. His final version of *Dead Souls* remained confined within that same fatal pietism as before. This was his ultimate ruin.

Gogol had no direct influence on the history of Russian religious development. He remained on the sidelines, disassociating himself from the themes and interests of his generation and its philosophical debates. Only a half-century later did anyone recognize him as a religious teacher; only in the epoch of Russian neo-romanticism did his religio-romantic motifs once more come to life.

In his own day his alarm and premonition of social upheaval and disorder separated and estranged him from the Slavophiles. He lived too long in the West, and during its most "social years," in the years of utopias and premonitions, on the eve of an explosion. How typical was his coupling of apocalyptical trembling with the "calculations" of his utopian projects. This was also typical for pietism (compare this with Zhukovskii). Gogol expresses the temptation of the utopian side of Christian cultural problematics, with its dangers and discontinuities. His writings were, in part, an inner opposition to the pronounced patriarchal complacency found too strongly in individual Slavophiles.

VII

A. S. KHOMIAKOV –"KNIGHT OF ORTHODOXY"

A. S. Khomiakov was the systematic expositor of Slavophile doctrine. The word "system," however, need not be taken literally or narrowly. He had no unified system and wrote only occasionally, fragmentarily, though always in bold strokes. Yet for all his constant watchfulness and exaltation, he had a systematic mind. In the words of Herzen, "he slept fully armed, like a medieval knight."

Khomiakov's personality remains somewhat beclouded. We do not know how his steadfast spiritual and intellectual character took

shape, and what we know of his youth provides little explanation for the way in which his worldview was constructed. One gets the impression that Khomiakov did not "become," but was "born." According to Berdiaev, "Khomiakov was born into God's world already religiously prepared, a man of the Church... He experienced no revolution, no change, no faithlessness." It is true that Khomiakov did not suffer doubts and crises, and he preserved an indomitable faith from the very beginning. However, there is no need to exaggerate the equilibrium and tranquility of his spiritual temperament, and this "tranquility of life in the Church" should not be equated with any peacefulness in his personal life.

In any case, Khomiakov was a born dialectician, always grounding and developing his thought in conversation, argument, or instruction, and thereby constantly altering it or changing his opinion. All who comment on Khomiakov mention this trait in his spiritual make-up.[151] There was something "Socratic" in his constitution. "He loved to carry on debate by the Socratic method," Koshelev says about him.

> A man of powerful and agile mind, rich in resources and unscrupulous in their use, possessed of a prodigious memory and a power of rapid reflection, he spent his entire life in heated and indefatigable argument. An unswerving and tireless fighter, he cut and thrust, attacked and pursued, rained down witticisms and quotations, and frightened and chased his opponents into a forest, from which without prayer there was no return. (Herzen)

Khomiakov's resoluteness stemmed from loyalty, courage, and self-possession. But he was not so much "born" resolute as much as he existed in a resoluteness enforced by his sense of loyalty. Berdiaev. aptly dubbed him a "knight of the Orthodox Church." In this regard Khomiakov is visibly different from Konstantin Aksakov or Petr Kireevskii, who were both dominated by an actual innate serenity. But Ivan Kireevskii was also an "unconquerable dialectician" (in Polevoi's words).

A very reserved man, Khomiakov did not like to talk about his private life. We know and see his behavior only socially, at Moscow parties, at all those literary and non-literary soirees that took place at least three times a week. In truth he could sometimes give the impression of being only an able disputer. "Gorgias, the disputer of this world." Herzen repeats this phrase of the "half-demented" Moroshkin

and adds for his part "a hardened old duelist in dialectics."[152] The historian S. M. Solov'ev gives a still more acerbic appraisal of Khomiakov in his complacent and venomous *Memoirs.*[153] Herzen gained the impression that Khomiakov was more apparent than real. However, he later reexamined and corrected this estimate after detecting and comprehending a wholly unseen depth in Khomiakov.

Very little is known about Khomiakov's inner life. Practically the sole testimony comes from a story by Iurii Samarin, who emphasizes that this was the only time that Khomiakov divulged to him the world of his "personal, inner sensations." This episode occurred shortly after the death of Khomiakov's wife:

> His life became divided. During the day he worked, read, talked, occupied himself with his affairs, and gave of himself to anyone who had business with him. But when night fell and all lay quiet around him, another time began for him... Once I lived with him at Ivanskoe. As he had several guests, all the rooms were occupied, and he moved my bed into his own room. After dinner, following long conversations enlivened by his inexhaustible gaiety, we retired, blew out the candles, and I fell asleep. Long after midnight I was awakened by some murmuring in the room, which dawn had barely begun to illuminate. Without moving or making a sound I began to peer about and listen. He was kneeling before his traveling icon, his arms crossed on a cushioned chair, his head resting in his hands. A restrained sobbing reached my ears. This continued until morning. Of course, I affected to be asleep. The next day he greeted us gaily and spiritedly, with his usual good-natured smile. From a person who accompanied him everywhere I heard that this recurred nearly every night.

Samarin concludes his story with a general characterization:

> No other man on earth [was] to such a degree disinclined and opposed to being carried away with his personal feelings and to yielding the clarity of consciousness to his nervous irritation. His inner life was distinguished by temperance—the dominant trait of his piety. Feelings and emotions he even feared, knowing that man is too disposed to placing himself at the service of every worldly feeling, every falling tear. When emotion overcame him, he deliberately poured

> cold water over himself, in order not to allow his spirit to evaporate in fruitless transports, and with all his strength he directed his spirit toward work.

Khomiakov's sense of loyalty tempered his soul. His wholeness was not a simple rigidity or primitive naivete. It was formed through trial and experience, if not through temptation. It is not accidental that he was a convinced voluntarist in metaphysics. The elasticity of his thought, his "willful reason," is the most discernible quality in his worldview.

However important the category of "custom" [*byt*] might be in Khomiakov's constructions, it is utterly impossible to derive his worldview from a self-perception of "customary life."[154] He had no feeling for the land. On the contrary, one frequently gets the impression that he had no roots in the soil—an impression that this "willful reason" is excessively intense, and above all that the historiosophical schemes Khomiakov drew up were excessively transparent and not based on any tranquility of customary life. His acceptance of the Church can least of all be identified with an acceptance of customary life. He might instead be criticized for the very opposite, and his worldview provides some basis for the doubts formulated so sharply by Father Pavel Florenskii.[155] In Khomiakov's depiction the self-sufficiency of the Church is presented with such resigned obviousness that its historical reality remains as if in a shadow. But the terms "barren" and "bloodless" are least appropriate when describing his theological contemplations. Khomiakov's theological constructions inadequately sense the dynamism of history not because customary life rendered them imperturbable, but because they have a mystical fulfillment and "supracustomary" quality that is "not of this world."

The question of the "sources" of Khomiakov's theological or religio-philosophical views has yet to be taken up with due concreteness. He quite obviously had a serious acquaintance with patristic writings and the history of the ancient Church in general. During the 1840s many in Slavophile circles read the Holy Fathers, including people who were not temperamentally disposed to that sort of reading. Koshelev was one of these, and even Herzen, as he recalled in *My Past and Thoughts*, felt obliged to "read through the voluminous histories of Neander and Gfroerer and especially study the history of the ecumenical councils, with which he was little acquainted, in order to achieve an equal basis for debate with opponents."[156] There are grounds to suggest that Khomiakov devoted particular attention to St. Augustine (although he considered him the "true father of church

scholasticism"). His basic familiarity with contemporary German philosophy–Hegel and his critics–is incontestable. But the influence of Schelling, and likewise that of Baader, on Khomiakov is scarcely significant. And although he held a good deal in common with the "historical school" he remained indifferent to questions of *Naturphilosophie* and "cosmogony," and he had no interest in either Schelling or Jakob Böhme. More concrete comparisons are difficult to make.

There is a similarity with Möhler,[157] and it is well-known that on certain questions Khomiakov is close to Vigny. But only with reservations can one, following Vladimir Solov'ev, compare Khomiakov to the "French traditionalists" (Solov'ev had in mind Bonald and Lammenais, the latter during the period of his *Sur L'indifference en matiére de la Religion*). Berdiaev rightly observed that "the Slavophiles possessed the genius of freedom, the traditionalists the genius of authority." Curiously, however, precisely at that moment in France there emerged a succession of "lay theologians"– Maistre, Chateaubriand, Bonald, Montalembert[158] –eager to revive and strengthen the sense of the Church weakened during the revolutionary years. In any event, they took a position strikingly similar to that of the Slavophiles.

Of course resemblance should not be taken for influence. It is hardly sensible to insist on the "influence" of incidental books or authors (such as "a certain Bordas-Demoulin," whom Samarin sympathetically mentioned to Solov'ev, or the Dorpat theologian Sartorius, who accused Catholicism of rationalism).[159] In general, the question about the genesis of a system or worldview cannot be replaced by one about "influences." Not every influence is depended upon in the same way, and dependence does not signify direct borrowing. An "influence" can be a nudge or an inducement, or it can be actually operating in reverse. In any case, a thinker's independence should not be obscured by some reference to "influence," a question that may be properly posed and hopefully resolved only when the genetic process as a whole is restored and traced through its changing phases. It is much more important to discern and grasp the fundamental intuition and discover the point of departure in a development. Without that it is difficult to speak about "influences."

And here there can be no doubt that Khomiakov proceeded from the inner experience of the Church. He does not so much construe or explain as describe, and this is his strength. He gives an eyewitness account of the reality of the Church as it is revealed from the inside, through the experience of its inner life. In this regard Khomiakov's theology bears the quality and character of testimony. Any similarity

or resemblance to Möhler must be considered not on the level of "influence," but on the level of experience and testimony, as an approach to the same reality from different sides and from different points of departure.[160] Common to both appears to be a consciousness of being in the Church as a method of theological investigation and knowledge. To be in the Church is a necessary precondition for theological knowledge–Christianity can only be known from within. "Like the entire life of the Spirit, this confession is accessible only to the believer and member of the Church." Iurii Samarin, in his famous "Foreword," has already noted the experiential character of Khomiakov's way of elaborating theology. "Khomiakov ascertained the realm of light, the atmosphere of the Church." Therein lies his historical influence and significance.

Khomiakov's theological writings were first published only posthumously. They came into theological use only later, for many mistrusted him, a mistrust and caution fully explained by his novelty. He had an innovative method, but not an innovative content–he called for a return along the "forgotten path of experiential knowledge of God." This was precisely what subsequent generations valued and continue to value in him. This experiential quality in his theology confused the adherents of the old method.

The most important work in Khomiakov's theological legacy is his *Experiment in a Catechetical Exposition of the Teaching on the Church* [*Opyt' katikhizicheskago izlozheniia ucheniia o tserkvi,* published only in 1864]. Khomiakov himself gave it the simple title *The Church is One* [*Tserkov' odna*], which is at once the theme and the thesis, the premise and the conclusion.[161] The "literary type" to which this catechetical "experiment" relates must immediately be specified. In Khomiakov one seeks in vain for definitions and proofs. He poses and solves another problem. Actually, from the outset he excludes the possibility of defining or proving anything by formal argumentation, which might also tie and bind the unbeliever. Khomiakov denies the very possibility or hope of "demonstrating the truth and reaching it by the power of one's reason." He is speaking here about the knowledge of Christian truth. "But the powers of reason do not reach the truth of God, and human weakness is made manifest in the weakness of proofs." He consciously refrains from giving proofs or definitions– he testifies and describes. Instead of logical determinations he seeks to trace out the image of the Church, to portray it in all its spiritual vitality, in its self-evident character. Moreover, he sounds a call to take the key and pass through the gates of the Church. The key is faith. "Christian knowledge is no affair for the investigation

of reason, but for faith in life and grace." To authority Khomiakov opposes freedom, not as a right but as a responsibility. This means he opposes the inner evidence of truth to the formal compulsion of external proofs.

He makes no allowance for freedom of personal or private opinions–he always insists on the very opposite. Therefore he discounts rational persuasion, because each person reasons for himself and from himself. But faith is not and cannot be a "private affair," for faith is communion with Christ. Faith, which comes from a united and singular Spirit, is therefore always something held in common–it is a common affair.

> You understand Scripture to the extent that you hold fast to Tradition, and to the extent that you welcome wisdom and make its works alive within you. But the wisdom that lives within you is not given to you personally, but as a member of the Church. It has been given to you in part, without entirely eliminating your personal error, but it is granted to the Church in the fulness of truth, without a tinge of error. Therefore do not judge the Church, but humble yourself before her, lest you cut yourself off from wisdom.

The Church depicted by Khomiakov is above all a unity: "the unity of divine grace living among the plurality of rational creatures who submit to grace." Two motifs are coordinated in this definition: the "unity" [*edinstvo*] and the "submission" [*pokornost'*] of man. "Grace is granted even to the unsubmissive, who do not use it (who bury their talent), but they are not in the Church." Only by submission, that is, by one's free communion and in love, can one belong to and dwell within the Church. "She [the Church] receives unto her bosom only those who are free," notes Samarin. Freedom is revealed and realized precisely in submission. For man finds nothing external or foreign to himself in the Church. "In her he finds himself, not in the impotence of his spiritual singularity, but in the power of his spiritual, sincere unity with his brothers, with his Savior." This power is not that of a divided multitude gathered in unity, nor that of a simple fusion or union of human possibilities. The power comes from the Spirit of God. "Each of us, from earth–one Church, from heaven." The power of unity lies in the fact that only the Lifecreating Spirit can truly unify. It is not agreement as such, but agreement in the Church, that is, in Christ and in the Spirit, that assures and testifies to the truth.

When in his polemic against the "western confessions" Khomiakov counterposes the "holy unity of love and prayer" to "personal separateness," he makes no distinction between the "agreement of all in love" and the "grace of the Lifecreating Spirit," whose power alone can establish "agreement" or "unity." The entire value of agreement" lies in the irrefutable way it testifies about grace and the presence of the Spirit, without which agreement is impossible. Wavering "belief" [*verovanie*] is transformed into the inflexibility of "faith" [*vera*] only by the power of the Holy Spirit.

> Faith is the imprint the Holy Spirit leaves on belief. But this imprint is not granted to the man who lives according to his own judgment; it is utterly denied to the man who dwells in his individual, singular subjectivity. It has been granted once and for all to the apostolic Church gathered in the holy unity of love and prayer on the great day of Pentecost. And from that time onward the Christian–the subjective man, by his own moral infirmity a blind protestant–becomes a seeing catholic in the holiness of the apostolic Church, to which he belongs as an indivisible part.

This plural character of the believers is not the result of one "becoming a catholic," but the result of partaking of the unity of grace. "Catholic" or "conciliar" [*sobornyi*] does not mean "universal." At this point he is not speaking of numbers, expansion, or the geographical sense of "universal," but of something immeasurably higher. "All of your names come from human accident, but ours is derived from the very essence of Christianity." St. Athanasius understood catholicity in the same way. For Khomiakov "conciliarity" [*sobornost'*] in no way coincides with "commonness" or corporateness. In his understanding conciliarity is generally not a human, but a divine characteristic of the Church. "It is not the person or the multitude of persons, but the Spirit of God living in the totality of the Church who preserves and writes tradition in the Church." "Moral unity" is only a human condition and a guarantee of this conciliar transfiguration by the Spirit.

> The distinguishing sign of the Divine in the Church is seen in the inner wholeness and catholicity of her path, her truth, her life, her total unity–not in the sense of an arithmetical or mechanical aggregate of all parts and members, for at any given moment no such formal aggregate actually exists,

> but in the sense of a mystical (supraconscious) bond and spiritual-moral community of all parts and members, between themselves and in common with the Divine Head.[162]

Only by a misunderstanding can Khomiakov be accused of linking the unity of the Church only to moral or psychological traits, "exaggerating the significance of human agreement and discord," and diminishing the "dignity and value of Truth." Father Pavel Florenskii expressed such a rebuke in a particularly trenchant way at a later date. "From the general meaning of the system it is not at all clear if for Khomiakov God's grace had any vital, substantial meaning or if it was just decorative." Florenskii thought it possible to link the entire meaning of Khomiakov's polemic against the "western confessions" to a desire to "surround law and compulsion, as elements of the Romance peoples, with sociality and consanguinity, as elements of the Slavic peoples." In the doctrine of "conciliarity" Florenskii detects only a hidden socialism, a "cautious approach to a theory of universal human sovereignty" ("he explains everything from the social moment"). Such a reinterpretation of Khomiakov's views might more readily be termed invective than critical. No matter how socially ambiguous the Slavophiles could be in presenting their philosophical views, Khomiakov's doctrine of the Church remains completely true to fundamental and ancient patristic tradition.[163] He merely models his polemic on the ancient Church's custom of juxtaposing the Church and heresy above all as love and discord, or community and isolation–as did St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and, most pronouncedly of all, St. Augustine, who shifted the stress in a particularly expressive way precisely to love. It was precisely from this perspective that Augustine conducted his polemic against Donatism.[164]

Khomiakov could also have found a brilliant and highly incisive illustration of the principles of early church polemics in Möhler's remarkable book *Die Eineit in der Kirche.* While it is true that Khomiakov makes no reference to this book, Möhler's other works gained attention in Slavophile circles–both his *Symbolik, which refutes Protestantism precisely because it leads to individualization, and his*

attention in Slavophile circles–both his *Symbolik,* which refutes Protestantism precisely because it leads to individualization, and his remarkable monograph on St. Athanasius, in which he interprets his polemic against the Arians in the same spirit of "conciliarity" that he directed against the spirit of contradiction and schism. Khomiakov closely followed contemporary theological literature, and it is difficult to believe that this remarkable book about the Church remained un-

known or inaccessible to him. The very title of Möhler's book, *Unity in the Church, or the Principle of Catholicity,* is quite indicative. The most accurate equivalent here to the term "catholicity" would be precisely *sobornost'*, and Möhler himself defines "catholicity" precisely as unity in plurality, as the continuity of common life. Khomiakov's originality is not diminished by this juxtaposition–diverse historical perspectives only further enhance his image.

Khomiakov could above all have found in Möhler a congenial generalization of patristic testimony, for in his book Möhler elaborated the doctrine of the Church "in the spirit of the fathers of the Church of the first three centuries." Khomiakov's spiritual encounter with Möhler is quite characteristic. Möhler belonged to the generation of German Catholic theologians who carried on in those years an inner struggle with the age of the Enlightenment–with the spirit of "Josephinism" or the so-called "Febronianism."[165] This struggle was not carried on for the sake of a restored Tridentine scholastic tradition, but in the name of a religious recovery of patristic wholeness. Such was the Tübingen "Catholic school," to which, in addition to Möhler, belonged Drey, Hirscher, and in the next generation Staudenmaier, Kuhn, and Hefele.[166] Above all a historical school of theology, it proposed as the purpose of church history the depiction of the Church–this divine-human, Spirit-bearing organism–in its inner formation and growth. The principle of the life of grace was opposed to the principle of formal authority, marking an inward surmounting of that "romantic" spirit or ultramontanism whose highest point appeared later in the Vatican Council.[167] The Old Catholic opposition found their nourishment precisely in the spirit of the Tübingen school.

A general effort to achieve an ecclesiastical self-awareness, heightened by a feeling for the Church, accompanied the restoration of sensitivity to the historical dimension of the Church. Supplementing this effort was a philosophical design similar to that encountered in Kireevskii: the experience of the Holy Fathers had to be combined or "considered" together with the experience of contemporary learning and modern philosophy. Möhler's teaching on the Church in particular contains a creative adaptation or utilization of motifs taken from Schelling, Hegel, and even Schleiermacher. In his later works he underscores the image of the Church in a manner directly and consciously opposed to Hegel's state. One must always bear in mind that Möhler's synthesis proceeds not from "abstract principles" or abstract philosophical premises, but from concrete existence, from the reality of grace in the Church. He does not construct an intellectual scheme, but describes a living experience. Möhler judges and refutes the Reforma-

tion, that is, he refutes the very principle of Protestantism, from the depths of an ecclesiastical self-awareness and an experience of the reality of the Church.

A well-known affinity exists between Möhler's *Symbolik* and the polemical program contained in Khomiakov's famous pamphlet "On Western Confessions."[168] Khomiakov wrote this pamphlet for private reasons, almost as it were accidentally, at another's urging. But its theme is organically drawn from the spirit of his system itself. Because Khomiakov regarded as most important and primary the ontological unity, the conciliarity or catholicity, in the life of the Church, he had at once to explain the possibility of division in the Christian world, as well as the meaning of the divisions and separations that had actually occurred. Hence he shifted the stress onto the moral plane in order to underscore the deficiency of love as the source of the western schism. He strove to show or lay bare the very root of the schism and demonstrate the basic separating force.

Khomiakov can least of all be suspected of undervaluing the significance and importance of dogmatic deviations and errors. In any case, in his correspondence with Palmer[169] Khomiakov insisted with complete candor on the necessity of preliminary agreement and harmony on dogma, emphasizing that the Church cannot be "reunited on differences of opinion." But in so doing he also maintained that any simple agreement concluded intellectually and even sincerely, any concordance with the fulness of the catholic teaching of the Church, is only a small part of what it means to belong to the Church to the fullest extent of one's abilities in life. A "moral impediment"–the will to division–still remains.

Khomiakov had to establish the fundamental presuppositions for a discussion of the question of individual "confessions." In the history of the Orthodox confession (or in so-called "polemical theology") he rendered an incomparable service by departing from the traditional, barren casuistry and supplying a principled, public statement of the question. His outlines are much too orderly, and he somewhat oversimplified the history of the Christian West, coercing it into a scheme of a collapse of "unity" and "freedom" because of an impoverished love. Khomiakov's polemical "pamphlets," however, should not be accepted as anything other than what they claim to be: an outline, a rough draft, an introduction, and not a system. In any event, he formulated the problem forcibly and in its essentials.

VIII

DIALECTICAL OR ORGANIC WHOLENESS: SAMARIN AND KHOMIAKOV

Among Khomiakov's systematic views, his understanding and estimation of the historical disclosure and self-realization of apostolic tradition (usually denoted in the West by the imprecise term "dogmatic development") merit special attention. At the beginning of the 1840s a quarrel on this theme broke out in Slavophile circles. The occasion for it was provided by Iurii Samarin, who at that very moment was experiencing an acute passion for Hegelian philosophy. He had just passed his master's degree examination, and had written his dissertation on Stefan Iavorskii and Feofan Prokopovich.[170] In the history of the Russian Church during the reign of Peter I Samarin saw a clash of two principles: Romanism and Protestantism. He conceived of the clash as a dialectical encounter, which raised for him the more general question of the directions of ecclesiastical-dogmatic development. "We confess the Church which is developing"—this is the motif he emphasized. (He is speaking about himself and Konstantin Aksakov, who at that time also was passing through a Hegelian phase.) Soon, however, under the pressure and persuasion of Khomiakov, Samarin greatly altered his mode of thought, reconstructed his dissertation, and mitigated the unqualified dialectical character of his original scheme.

From Samarin's notebooks and from his correspondence with A. N. Popov,[171] one of the participants in the Slavophile gatherings who wholly took Khomiakov's side, we can form a judgment of his original premises. And Khomiakov's point of view becomes still more understandable by contrast to Samarin's. The first point of the dispute concerned the correlation of two moments in the Church. Samarin distinguished and separated life and consciousness, and began his dialectical progression from this initial tension. As a rebuttal Popov advanced Khomiakov's reminder that in the Church "teaching lives and life teaches." Thus two different understandings of the historical process encountered one another. For Samarin dialectics posits division as the point of departure (which fully conforms to the Hegelian style), while Khomiakov's organic point of view is predicated on an original wholeness. Samarin made too sharp a distinction between two indivisible aspects of the being of the Church: the Church as the life of the

sacraments (and he admitted no development of this aspect), and the Church as a school.

> The development of the Church as a school is an aspiration to elevate life into a strict system of dogmatics. In time this second aspect revealed itself as something higher in significance than the first. The ecumenical council marks a higher stage in the development of the Church, corresponding in this regard to the fact that the sacraments exist in daily life and consequently are generally a higher manifestation of the Church.

Until victory is won, this tension between the immediacy of life and consciousness in the Church "combattant"(that is,militant) cannot and will never be removed. Development does not cease. "The Church develops, that is, it constantly leads to its eternal consciousness, to its inexhaustible truth, which it possesses." This does not mean that only through this process of self-awareness did it first become the Church. The Church existed from the beginning. However, for Samarin consciousness marks a higher stage.

Samarin assigns to philosophy the role of judge in the clash of theological opinions. As he wrote to Popov:

> A study of Orthodoxy has led me to the conclusion that Orthodoxy will realize its potential and triumph only when it is justified by science [i. e., philosophy], that the problem of the Church rests on a philosophical question, and that the fate of the Church is intimately and indissolubly linked with the fate of Hegel.

He promptly gives reasons for this unexpected assertion. He sees Orthodoxy's preeminence wholly in the fact that the Church does not aspire to absorb either science or the state (as Catholicism does), and recognizes their relationship "as separate spheres" with relative freedom. "[The Church] acknowledges herself only as a Church." In a completely Hegelian spirit Samarin confines the Church to the isolated moment of faith, limiting it to one religious moment as such. Religion must not try to become philosophy, for it would disturb its independence. It obviously follows, reasoned Samarin, that philosophy is preeminent, for only philosophy can guarantee the inviolability of the religious sphere and erect a firm border between reason and faith. "It [philosophy] recognizes religion, with all its peculiarities, mysteries, and miracles, as a separate sphere." Samarin saw

the falseness of western confessions precisely in the lack of differentiation into "separate spheres." Only Orthodoxy could be justified by contemporary philosophy: "Philosophy defines its [Orthodoxy's] place as an eternally existing moment in the development of the spirit and decides in its favor the quarrel between it and the western religious confessions." By "philosophy" Samarin meant Hegel, and he stressed that "outside of this philosophy the Orthodox Church cannot exist."

There is no need to go into the details of Khomiakov's debate with Samarin, and we cannot reconstruct the details of its development. More important to an understanding of this quarrel are its premises. Upon reading Samarin's dissertation Khomiakov gave the following response: "It contains no open love for Orthodoxy. The mystery of life and its inner sources are inaccessible to science and belong only to love." The entire uniqueness of Khomiakov's doctrine on the development of the Church is rooted in that statement. "Knowledge of divine truth is granted through the mutual love of Christians, and has no other guardian except this love." (Khomiakov is referring to the famous circular letter of the eastern patriarchs of 1848.)[172]

The Church bears witness to itself. "The Church inherited from the blessed apostles not the word but rather the legacy of an inner life, a legacy of thought, inexpressible yet constantly yearning to express itself." As an organism of love the Church is not and cannot be subjected to the judgment of reason. On the contrary, "the work of reason is subject to the decisive scrutiny of the Church, but the decision of the Church flows out of an inner sense proceeding from God, and not from logical argumentation." Khomiakov stresses the identity and unbroken character of the Church's consciousness.

> The mind of the contemporary Church is the same mind that wrote the Scriptures, the same mind that subsequently acknowledged and revealed those Scriptures as sacred, the same mind that still later formulated their meaning at the councils and gave them symbolic form in rites. The mind of the Church, both in present times and in ages past, is an unbroken revelation and inspiration of the Spirit of God.

Khomiakov always considered theological definition and the interpretation of doctrinal proofs to be conditional, by which he meant not that what is uttered is not fully true, but that fulness and truth can be perceived and recognized only from within.

> All our words, if I dare express myself in this way, are not essentially the light of Christ, but only his earthly shadow... Blessed are they who, contemplating this shadow on the fields of Judah, are permitted to divine the heavenly light of Tabor.

Khomiakov hesitated to acknowledge dogmatic terminology as self-sufficient and adequate outside of experience, that is, as a demonstrative exposition.

> Analytical effort is inescapable; but it can be holy and good, for it testifies that the faith of the Christian is not merely an echo of ancient formulas. Still, it only hints at the treasury of profound and inexpressible thought intimately preserved by the Church in her bosom. This thought is not found in conscious ability alone; it ponders within the fulness of a rational and moral existence.

In this reasoning Khomiakov again remains completely faithful to the principles of patristic theology (compare the manner in which the Cappadocian fathers carried on their polemic against Eunomius and his religio-gnosiological hyper-optimism).[173]

There are no grounds for suspecting Khomiakov, as Father Pavel Florenskii did, of deliberately evading all "ontological precision." "How can one be Orthodox?" asks Khomiakov. He answers:

> By believing unconditionally in what is pronounced by the entire Church, by knowing that everything the Church pronounces at any time will be unconditionally true, but also that on anything on which the Church has yet to speak nothing can be authoritatively stated in her name. One must try to humbly and sincerely understand, without, however, passing judgment where the Church has not yet herself judged.

No final theological system has yet been granted or is possible. Khomiakov and Samarin come together and agree on this conclusion, but they come to this common point by different paths and from different motives. Khomiakov always accepts theology as a living background, as the original and unalterable first gift of revelation in the Church. Theology can and must remain an "analytical" testimony and confirmation of that revelation. For Khomiakov theology describes the

reality of grace manifested and revealed in the inviolable and immutable experience of the Church. Samarin faithfully reproduced what was most basic in Khomiakov's understanding of the Church's self-perception: "The Church is not a doctrine, system, or institution. The Church is a living organism, an organism of truth and love, or more precisely truth and love as an organism." In his day Khomiakov's voice resounded as a reminder of the reality of the Church –a reminder that the experience of the Church is the primary source and measure of every genuine effort to construct theology.

A sign was thereby given for a return–a return from the school to the Church, which explains why the summons confused even the best of the contemporary "school theologians."[174] Contemporary Western European theology provided them with a more familiar context than that afforded by the restless and unexpected expanses of patristic theology and asceticism. Khomiakov's call seemed too daring and bold. Even the language of his essays seemed too vibrant, and because of this vitality, "too imprecise." For that reason Khomiakov's essays were delayed in the censorship in the West (the critics in the schools derived the same feeling of "imprecision" from Maistre's books). Even when Khomiakov's theological writings gained free circulation a special notice was given forewarning the reader of their scholarly imprecision: "the several imperfect and inexact expressions encountered derive from the fact that the author did not receive a specialized theological education." (This note of the censors was reproduced down to the 1900 edition.)

However, the ecclesiastical and spiritual circumstances soon changed. In the 1860s Khomiakov's influence could be clearly felt inside the walls of the church schools.

IX

"BUILDING IN THE DESERT"–RUSSIAN NIHILISM OF THE 1860'S

Three fundamental moments, three epochs, can be isolated in the historical life of Russian philosophy. The first spans almost exactly the three decades from the mid-1820s to the mid-1850s: the "marvelous decades" of Russian romanticism and idealism from the first circle of the Moscow "Lovers of Wisdom" to the Crimean War.[175]

This epoch came to a convulsive end, was torn asunder by a violent assault on the philosophical frame of mind, by a rebellion of the "sons" against the "fathers." The second epoch in the history of Russian thought–a time of great social and socio-political awakening, the time of the so-called "Great Reforms," followed by the "reaction"–nearly coincides with the second half of the nineteenth century.[176] This was a time of highly decisive displacements and the most profound stratifications throughout the structure and composition of Russian society and among all Russian people. But above all, as in the "thirties," a peculiar spiritual displacement or "breaking up of the ice" occurred.

People of utterly different molds, of the several generations who experienced the ordeal of the "emancipation," all concur on this point. Even the words they used inadvertently turned out to be the same. Strakhov[177] cleverly dubbed the years immediately following the Crimean War as a time of "ethereal revolution" [*vozdushnaia revoliutsiia*]. "It was the ether of youth, which is called love," said Shelgunov.[178] Giliarov-Platonov wrote, "It was the state of lovers before the wedding."[179] "We rushed about as if dazed by love," recalls Stasov.[180] Konstantin Leont'ev[181] also remembers those years: "I remember the time–truly it was a sort of dawn, an intellectual springtime. It was an unbounded transport of joy." Such agreement and consensus among contemporaries must be believed.

> The solution to the mysterious secret of the sixties lies in the fact that after Sevastopol everyone recovered their senses, began to think, and a critical mood prevailed. It was an astonishing age, a time when all wished to think, read, and study, and when anyone who had anything on his soul wished to shout it aloud.

Shelgunov's description conveys a feeling for the total uniqueness of the displacement: it was a universal displacement. During the "marvelous decades" this was still not the case. As Herzen says in *My Past and Thoughts*, "Thirty years ago the Russia of the future existed exclusively among a few youths who had just left childhood." The broad "social" movement began only later, in the "sixties."

Negation preceded the new movement. The true meaning of "nihilism," as it was then called, is not contained only in the fact that the nihilists broke with outworn traditions and rejected or destroyed a decayed customary life. The "negation" was much more decisive and universal, and in this lay its attraction. Not only did

the nihilists negate and reject their own given and obsolete past, but precisely any "past" in general. At that time, in other words, they rejected history. More than anything else, Russian "nihilism" in those years meant a most violent assault by an anti-historical utopianism. Far from being a "temperate" age, it was exactly intemperate, a time of animation, paroxysm, and obsession. Behind the "critical" facade of public acts lay concealed non-critical presuppositions, a vestige of "Enlightenment" dogmatism. In a direct and strict sense this was a step backward to the authority of the eighteenth century. A deliberate archaism pervades the style of the "sixties." The sympathetic return to Rousseau (in part via Proudhon) proved to be most characteristic of all. The rejection of history that had taken root was inescapably transformed into a "simplification," or a general negation of culture. Culture does not and cannot exist other than in history, in the historical element; that is, within uninterrupted tradition. Even prior to Tolstoi (who in this respect was a nihilist and a typical "man of the sixties"), Pisarev and Varfolomei Zaitsev preached "simplification": a return from "history" to "nature," a reinclusion of man in the "natural order," in the order of substance, of Nature.[182]

At the same time there was a return from the "objectivity" of idealism in ethics to "subjectivity," a return from "moralism" to "morality" (speaking in Hegelian terms) and from the historicism of Hegel or Schelling to Kant–precisely to the Kant of the second *Critique* with its abstract moralism, to Kant in the spirit of Rousseau.[183] This was once again that same utopian abuse of the category of the "ideal," an abuse of the right to make "moral judgments" and assessments, against which Hegel so heatedly and insistently inveighed. The psychological meaning of any utopianism, which always claims to somehow redesign reality "according to new rules," lies precisely in the transforming of "abstract" and self-sufficient ideals into dogma. There is a great and immutable truth in the ethics of the "categorical imperative," and moral judgment cannot and must not be replaced or obscured by anything else. However, as frequently happens, imperativeness degenerates into a dreamy pretentiousness, into a certain obsession with farfetched reforming plans. Any sense of historical reality is lost. Apollon Grigor'ev aptly described the role of the "iron-willed seminarian" in the history of Russian negation and nihilism. He primarily had in mind Irinarkh Vvedenskii,[184] but his kind was very typical. There were many such "seminarians."

> Once they are set in their particular views, in a particular scheme–whether it be the theme of inversion, administrative

> centralization on the French model (as with Speranskii), or phalansteries (as with many of our literary celebrities)–what do they care if life screams out from the Procrustean bed of this same inversion, administrative plan, or petty social ideal? They themselves were beaten in the seminary, oppressed in the academy–so why shouldn't life also function in the same cruel way?

This was scholasticism turned upside down. From one contemporary leader slipped out the notable phrase: "to build in the desert." Such a self-perception–"feeling oneself in history as if in a desert"– is very characteristic for a utopian, for whom the "historical" is doomed to destruction. And the "schism among the nihilists" did not disturb complete unanimity on this utopian moralism. [185] In this regard there is no difference between the men of the "sixties" and the men of the "seventies." While it is true that the nihilists of the sixties verbally repudiated independent ethics and all ethics in general, substituting the principles of "utility," "happiness," and "satisfaction" for moral categories, they nonetheless remained completely captivated by this same copybook moralism. By their very hedonism or utilitarianism they remained genuine pedants and "legalists," for they advanced a peculiar system of "knowledge" and "rules"–common knowledge and simple rules–in opposition to historical reality. In spite of his verbal repudiation of any knowledge of goals or any right to pass judgment, did not Pisarev censure and condemn all historical culture with "primers" in his hands? Was Bentham not himself the typical legalist? And after him the Mills?[186] Did this very principle of "utilitarianism" not demand a continual remeasuring of values in order to establish with precision the "greatest" utility or happiness?

The most extreme contemporary "realists" pretended in vain that the biological doctrine of evolution once and for all removes all "teleological" categories or judgments. Darwinism remained in actuality a thoroughly critico-moralistic doctrine, except that in this system the terms "goal" and "value" are disguised as "adaption." Hence, only a short and easy step was required to reach the outright moralism of the seventies, when "ideal" became the most common and alluring word, and when the terms "duty" and "sacrifice" were uttered with the greatest frequency. This was merely a new variation on an earlier theme. However, this pathos for moralistic or hedonistic "lawgiving" also constitutes a psychological vestige of and relapse to the Enlightenment. And it is so strange that such a belated and backwards anti-historical nihilism, that historical *netovshchina*, could

become so popular in Russia at the dawn of an era of historical labor and inquiry, and in the context of a great historiosophical receptivity.

From the 1860s onward one can discern a paradoxical and very unhealthy rupture in Russian culture; not simply a rupture, but precisely a paradox. The second half of the nineteenth century has more than anything else been celebrated in the history of Russian creativity as a new esthetic ascent, with a new religious-philosophical awakening. After all, it was the age of Dostoevskii and Tolstoi, the age of the lyrical poets Tiutchev and Fet,[187] the age of Serov, Chaikovskii, Borodin and Rimskii-Korsakov,[188] the age of Vladimir Solov'ev, Leont'ev, Apollon Grigor'ev and Fedorov,[189] and many others. Such names symbolize the age, and they mark the creative main line of Russian culture. But Russian "self-awareness" did not equal or follow the creative line. "Destruction of esthetics" (from Pisarev to Lev Tolstoi) was the response to the new ascent of artistic genius, and often the most insipid and ignorant rationalism was ranged against the religious yearning and fever. Once again a rupture and divergence occurred between "intellect" and "instinct," between reason and intuition. "Intellect" is blinded and withers in such self-confinement; it loses access to the depths of experience and as a consequence ponders, judges, condemns, but least of all understands. And yet "intuition" comes precisely before this blind reason to be justified. A new social rupture–one between the creative and productive minority and the group usually termed the "intelligentsia"–was linked with this phenomenon. Scorn became the established attitude toward philosophy and "metaphysics." Philosophers were barely tolerated. And although in reality society as a whole languished in philosophical restlessness, "enlightenment," i. e., dilettantism, and not creativity, was prescribed to alleviate it. Enter the "man of mixed ranks" [*raznochinets*].[190]

A new struggle began, a genuine struggle for thought and culture. This was not merely a contest with an external enemy, as it had been in the time of political reaction, when "philosophy," as a "rebellious science" of doubtful utility but obvious danger, had been excluded from the university program of instruction. Now the struggle shifted profoundly. The battle came to be not with conservatism or with the stagnation of antiquated prejudices, but with an imaginary "progressivism" or simplification, with a general lowering of the cultural level. "Philosophy has lost credit throughout Europe," in the words of the then popular Lewes, which Russian radicals of that time loved to recall and repeat.[191] The negation of philosophy, or, more accurately, the disavowal of philosophy, signified precisely a moralistic

deception: the alteration of the criterion of "truth," or the criterion of "utility" as a substitute for it. This was a fatal disease, untamed by intellectual conscience.

Mikhailovskii's affirmation characterizes the entire period: "The human personality is broader than truth."[192] The necessity of truth was simply lost, as was the sense of a wise humility before reality and objectivity. The "human personality" liberated itself from the reality by which it orders its demands and desires. The "plasticity"of reality was postulated and affirmed. No matter how much they spoke of "realism" at the time, no matter how much they studied the natural sciences, the mood of those years can least of all be described as "realistic." On the contrary, the theories and doctrines of the entire second half of the nineteenth century display, above all, the extreme tension of a distracted imagination. Bookishness and a study-hall atmosphere were especially striking during the "sixties." In fact, it was precisely as dilettants, and not as creative individuals, that they elaborated their "cultural-social self-awareness," and they did so in the pages of the "thick journals," not in the laboratories.[193]

The mind became accustomed to living within selected doctrinal limits, dooming itself to a solitary confinement: not to possess, love, or want, and even to fear "the vistas of objective reality," thereby decreeing disinterested knowledge to be impossible and unattainable, "pure art" to be impossible and unnecessary, and truth to be merely the "gratification of the need for knowledge." This was the most harmful doctrinairism. "A new faith burned in the heart, but the intellect did not function because prepared and unconditional answers had already been devised for every question." (Vladimir Solov'ev) In this connection, no substantive difference existed between the successive generations of the Russian intelligentsia, no matter how much they diverged and disagreed among themselves in other respects. In the accurate observation of S. L. Frank,[194] the Russian *intelligent* always "avoided reality, fled from the world, and lived in a world of phantoms, of dreams, of a pious faith outside of day to day historical life." This was the worst and most somber "asceticism," a love of and will to poverty, but certainly not a "holy poverty," for it possessed scarcely any humility. It was a self-satisfied, haughty, pretentious, and even malicious poverty.

This vestige of the "Enlightenment" expressed nothing creative in Russian culture, and, of course, could not express anything. But as a graft it was very dangerous and infectious. "The right to philosophical creativity," in Berdiaev's words, "was voted down in the supreme court of social utilitarianism." This utilitarian-moralistic

trauma proved to be particularly malignant and creeping in the Russian soul.

The celebrated polemic against Iurkevich and Larov in *The Contemporary* is quite instructive in this regard.[195] However, it was not a polemic, but a hunt: "hoots and catcalls are the best weapons of conviction!" At that time Chernyshevskii was likened to Askochenskii.[196] The comparison is psychologically accurate, for both were first and foremost embittered seminarians. Neither debated as much as settled accounts, although not personal ones. Both put much more effort into discrediting and drawing unpleasant suspicions on an opponent than they did trying to refute him. This method did not entail reading the works to be refuted. Radicals admitted and gave testimony on this point. Chernyshevskii "made short work of" his adversaries, and not just his adversaries. To him it was obvious that Iurkevich did not read "respectable books," i. e., Feuerbach.[197] With a frightening and undue familiarity Chernyshevskii rejected the western authors who served as Iurkevich's sources, comparing Schopenhauer with Karolina Pavlova and Mill with Pisemskii.[198] Proudhon simply read too many backwards and harmful books.[199] Chernyshevskii never entered into a deliberation of the substance of any matter.

Pisarev went even farther and protested against deliberation in general. "Simple common sense" is better than any deliberation, and, according to him, whatever cannot be readily grasped by any man without preparation is deliberate over-indulgence and rubbish. He was upset with Lavrov's articles because he could not understand how an author could define or analyze an idea according to strict proofs. All this amounted to "intellectual acrobatics" for Pisarev.

> What natural and vital need is met by resolving the question "What am I?" To what end could the solution to this problem lead in the realm of private or public life? Seeking the answer to such a question is like searching for a way to square a circle.

It was necessary to accept a certain very new code, precisely without reasoning.

Apollon Grigor'ev quite aptly dubbed the nihilists "men of the modern Pentateuch." Bachner, Moleschott and Vogt constituted obligatory reading (as did Feuerbach, who is rarely mentioned directly, and then quickly passed off as a vulgar materialist).[200] Vladimir Solov'ev perceptively spoke of the replacing of "catechisms" with "obligatory authorities." "As long as the materialist dogma remained

unconditionally in force there could be no talk of any intellectual progress." The prevailing moods within the realm of the natural sciences itself undoubtedly marked a backwards step in comparison with even the famous *Letters on the Study of Nature* by Iskander.[201] It is true that great and rapid advances were made as regards experiments, but once again thought did not begin to function in accord with this external experience. A retarded self-awareness was the first consequence of the "nihilist" displacement.

Not only was society split, but the creative minority lost the sympathy of their environment. Consciousness also became divided–creative impulses were driven out by the social-utilitarian censorship at the same time as doctrinal primers were being hastily drawn up. In general, culture proved to be "unjustified" in the eyes of its very participants and architects. Hence all the feelings of remorse and unjust wealth. "The entire history of our intellectual development is painted with a bright moral-utilitarian color," S. L. Frank justly remarked. "The Russian *intelligent* knows of no absolute values, no criteria, no orientation in life other than the moral differentiation of human actions, be they fine or harmful, good or evil." This is precisely the source of that characteristic Russian maximalism–an exaggerated sense of freedom and independence unrestrained or limited from within by that instinct for reality that had already been lost.

"Relativism" gave birth to the intolerance of the doctrinaire, guarding his arbitrary determinations, and this "nihilistic moralism" easily blends with pietist habits inherited from previous generations. Common to both is an indifference to culture and reality, an excessive withdrawal into oneself and an exaggerated interest in "experience." This is all psychologism with no outlet. To the very end of the century the sharp flavor of psychologism could clearly be detected in Russia's cultural creativity. "Metaphysics" seemed much too cold and unfeeling. "Ethics" or morality replaced it–the question of what ought to be replaced the question of what is, and therein lay a certain utopian flavor.

Theological interests too often followed the same trend. Too often attempts were made to dissolve dogmas themselves into "morals" or to transpose them from Greek "metaphysical" language into the language of Russian ethics. Here the "intelligentsia" and the "ascetics" converged. Ascetical psychologism won acceptance under the dual influence of Kant and Rischtl, with the philosophical inspiration of Lotz forming the background.[202] It may be true that these remarks are more applicable to a later period, but it was all an offshoot of these same "sixties." Overcoming psychologism proved to be a very

difficult task, for in reality it was a question of straightening out the intellectual conscience.

X

HISTORY AND THE HOLY LIFE

In the nineteenth century the entire history of the Russian intelligentsia unfolded under the influence of a religious crisis. Pisarev is perhaps more characteristic than others in this connection. Impressionistic to the point of illness, he went through the harshest of ascetic ordeals in his youth, a genuine ascetic rupture. The most decisive and overwhelming impression for him during those years was provided by Gogol's *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends.* Thus there already stood before him the typical question: "How can I live a holy life?" The *Correspondence* resolved the problem in the spirit of the most extreme maximalism, by which it is necessary to wholly and indivisibly surrender oneself to "one thing." Vain words and useless discussions quickly yield inescapable pangs of conscience.

On this psychological ground the youthful "society of thinking men" assembled. Led by Treskin, who played such a critical role in Pisarev's entire spiritual development,203

in Pisarev's entire spiritual development,[203] the circle met for "pious discussion and mutual moral support," which more readily evokes the Alexandrian mystics and freemasons than the Moscow circles of lovers of wisdom. Quite curiously, the stifling of sexual passion and attraction in all humanity numbered among their primary objectives–a portion of mankind might better perish and become extinct than live in sin. Hope remained, however, hope for a miracle. Men will suddenly become immortal "in reward for such human selflessness"... "or will be born in some miraculous manner unknown to the sin of the flesh." Pisarev's "nihilism" was fully prepared precisely by this dreamy moralistic exertion and rupture. Just before he joined *The Contemporary* he proposed to translate hymn XI of *The Messiah* for the religious journal *The Pilgrim* [*Strannik*].[204]

Ruptured religious feeling was also the cause of Dobroliubov's crisis, which occurred precisely through aroused religious experiences in his youth.[205] His was a crisis of faith in providence, a faith jolted and destroyed by the sudden and unexpected death of his parents.

This "injustice" convinced him, in his own words, "of the non-existence of those phantoms that the eastern imagination has created for itself." Also characteristic is Lesevich's religious crisis, produced under the influence of Feuerbach, but it unfolded more through the "logic of the heart" than through the logic of the mind.[206] Out of "pride" he deserted a passionate faith for a passionate atheism and struggle against God, refusing to acknowledge anything higher than man. Again, it was a rupture or rift in religious feeling.

Chernyshevskii's religious crisis proceeded along a different path. His was a crisis of viewpoint, not of convictions or beliefs; it was less a rupture than an evaporation of rational views, of something malleable and withered. The diary entries in which he speaks of his religious waverings are very bland—he neither believes nor resolves not to believe. Sentimental humanism with a religious tinge served as an intermediate step for him. In this regard there was no sharp difference between Feuerbach and French utopianism, for in actuality the image of Christ remained as a symbol of brotherly love and human nobility in the exegesis of Feuerbach. "Love is the central idea of Christianity" – this was the main thing for Chernyshevskii, and he had no need to believe in anything else. He simply passed via Feuerbach to a different "catechism."

By 1848 Chernyshevskii was awaiting a new messiah, a religious-social renewal of the world.

> It was sad, so very sad for me to part with Jesus Christ, who by his personality, goodness, and love of mankind is so good, so kind to the soul,, and who pours peace into my soul whenever I think of him.

Humanitarian sentimentalism was generally quite characteristic for him. For the sake of his conscience he decisively and curtly rejected the basic "dogma" of Darwinism—the struggle for survival—as immoral (as regards man, in any case). He upheld Lamarck's theory that creative adaption explains organic development.[207] Chernyshevskii, Kropotkin, and Mikhailovskii all somewhat unexpectedly concur with Danilevskii on this point.[208]

Religious denial, however, is not the same thing as indifference. It is more a sign of a constrained restlessness. This turbulent explosion of enthusiasm for religious utopianism—this exodus or "going to the people" ("to Thebes, or at least to the mountains of Phrygia," in G. P. Fedotov's comparison)[209]—certainly did not just suddenly happen in the beginning of the 1870s. "This was the genuine drama of a

growing and upright soul, these were the birth pangs of great thoughts and anxious queries of the heart," relates one of the participants in this chiliastic campaign. O. V. Aptekman recalls:

> Many times I observed how young men setting out to the people read the Gospels and wept bitterly over them. Why did they search the Scriptures?. . . Which of the strings of their souls were so touched by the "Good News?" The Cross and the Phrygian hat!. . . But this happened, it did happen! They almost all had copies of the Gospels.[210]

At the time of his "going to the people" the author of this memoir was himself baptized, "for the love of Christ" (as he himself says). The religiosity of that period was and remained close to the actual "Good News"; its sincerity of feeling and the reality of its religious need were unquestionable. As G. P. Fedotov remarks, "this was a long repressed howl, constrained by the powerful pressure of religious energy. . . before us is a madness of religious hunger unappeased for whole centuries." It is important to note that this was precisely a religious quest. Only "by the creation of a new religion" could the paroxysm of enthusiasm be fortified and converted "into a firm and indestructible feeling." The days of the naive materialism of the sixties were already over.

The 1870s saw a return to history, which was experienced in a religious way.

> From various quarters I began to hear this sort of opinion: the world is falling into evil and falsehood; science is not enough to save it, philosophy is powerless, and only religion–a religion of the heart–can give mankind happiness. (Aptekman)

This frequently meant a very strange religion, a "religion of brotherhood," a "religious populism," the curious quasi faith of Shatov, sometimes also a positive "religion of humanity" and even "spiritualism" (i. e., spiritism).[211] Bervi-Flerovskii's *Alphabet of the Social Sciences* [*Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*, 1871], one of the most characteristic and popular books of the age, was written precisely in the style of a catechism.[212] "I strove to create a religion of brotherhood!" This religious flame and thirst was powerful, even if it was only "religiosity without spirituality" (in Bogucharskii's apt phrase).[213] It was not simply an aimless illusion and enchantment or merely a whirl of notions

or ebullient emotions. A genuine and sincere thirst did, in any case, exist, even if it was often quenched by the surrogate and the self-suggested rather than by real food and drink.

One must particularly recall the enthusiasm that radical circles displayed for the Schism.[214] They tried to discover the social bases of religious movements. However, were the socialist movements not guided by a religious instinct, if only a blind one? "The martyrs for the two-fingered sign of the cross were answered two hundred years later by the martyrs for socialism," in the words of Fedotov. A. K. Malikov, the founder of the "God-men" [*bogocheloveki*] sect and a pre-Tolstoi proponent of non-resistance, preached a very characteristic doctrine.[215] At one time he possessed great influence over young radicals (for example, the so-called "Chaikovtsy" circle)[216] and persuaded many to follow him to the United States to build a religious commune. Apparently it was Malikov who first led Tolstoi to non-resistance. But where we find arguments from common sense in Tolstoi, in Malikov one can hear only the voice of an agitated heart. He preached a certain humanistic religion, almost an apotheosis of man. "We are all God-men." This particular doctrine may have been a subject of discussion since Pierre Leroux[217] and Feuerbach, but Malikov's direct play of emotion, or the exaltation of an aroused conscience, made it all the more important. The American commune, of course, failed. Malikov subsequently returned to the Church and discovered in its fulness the resolution to his anxious searchings.

The "seventies" revealed the apocalyptical strain in the history of Russian feeling. The comparison between the "going to the people" movement and the Crusades has some foundation.[218] Psychologically, the tradition of utopian socialism was once again enlivened and renewed in those years. A subconscious and misplaced thirst for *sobornost'*–even to the point of a monastic pathos–is easily discerned in the attraction to the ideal of the phalanstery or commune. This was a very characteristic symptom or indication of a troubled heart.

Fedor Dostoevskii laid bare and demonstrated the religious character of the contemporary Russian crisis. Personal experience and artistic penetration were intimately linked in his creative work.[219] He was able to express the secret of his age, and diagnose the still unnamed religious anguish. Dostoevskii defined the goal of his "huge" projected novel *Atheism* as "to relate only that which we Russians have all experienced in the last ten years of our religious development." He endeavored to comprehend contemporary Russian experience in its totality. Everything happening arround him excited him. But this was not merely idle curiosity. Dostoevskii saw and contemplated

how the ultimate fate of man comes to pass or is determined in the interweaving of everyday trifles and ordinary events. He studied the human personality not in its "empirical character" or in the interplay of visible causes and effects, but exactly in the "mind-perception" or in its Chthonian depths, where the mysterious currents of primordial life flow together and diverge. Dostoevskii studied man in his problematics, or, in other words, in the freedom he was granted to decide, choose, accept, reject, or even use to imprison himself or sell himself into slavery. And it is important here to emphasize that freedom actually becomes "objective" only through "problematics."

Dostoevskii did not just write about himself in his novels, nor did he "objectivize" only his own spiritual experience in his artistic images, in his "heroes." He had no single hero, but many of them. And each has not only a face, but a voice as well. Quite early the mysterious antinomy of human freedom was revealed to him. Man's entire meaning and joy in life lies precisely in his freedom, in his will to freedom, or in his "self-will." Even humility and repentance are possible only through "self-will," through self-rejection. Yet this self-will is too often transformed into self-destruction. Herein lies Dostoevskii's most intimate theme.

Dostoevskii not only depicted the tragic clash when different freedoms or self-wills cross each other—when freedom becomes coercion and tyranny for others—but he also demonstrated something more terrible: the self-destructiveness of freedom. In his persistent efforts at self-definition and self-affirmation man is cut off from tradition and from his environment. Dostoevskii reveals the spiritual danger of being "without soil" [*bez-pochvennosti*]. Singularity and individualization threaten a break with reality. The "wanderer" can only dream; he cannot escape from the world of illusions that, by a fatal image, his willful imagination has magically converted into a living world. The dreamer becomes an "underground man," and his personality painfully begins to decompose. Freedom in isolation becomes captivity; the dreamer becomes the prisoner of his dreams. Dostoevskii saw and depicted the mystical collapse of a self-contained boldness that develops into audacity or even mystical insolence. He shows how an empty freedom hurls itself into slavery either to passions or to ideas. He who makes an attempt on another's freedom is himself ruined. Therein lies the secret of Raskolnikov, the "secret of Napoleon."[220]

Yet Dostoevskii not only showed in images this dialectical idea-force as the ultimate and intimate theme of contemporary Russian life. He became the interpreter of the fate of that "accidental family,"

the radical intelligentsia of the 1860s, the "nihilists" of that time. Dostoevskii wished to reveal the mysterious fate of this quarreling and warring "family," instead of just the surface of its everyday life. Possession by a dream is even more dangerous than social misanthropy. And were not the Russian radicals and nihilists precisely possessed?

Freedom is just only through love, but love is possible only in freedom—through love for the freedom of one's neighbor. Unfree love inevitably grows into passion, becomes coercion for the loved one, and is fatal for the person who imagines that he is loving. In this is the key to Dostoevskii's synthesis. With frightening penetration he portrays the dialectical antinomy of unfree love. "The Grand Inquisitor" actually represents above all a sacrifice of love, an unfree love of one's neighbor that neither respects nor reverses any man's freedom, even that of the least among men. A love that exists in unfreedom and through unfreedom can only exhaust the enflamed heart and consume the imagined loved one: it murders them with deceit and spite. Is this antinomy not one of the focuses of the tragedy in *The Devils*?

The romantic solution to this antinomy did not satisfy Dostoevskii. Organic wholeness cannot be discovered through a return to nature or to the earth, no matter how attractive such a return might be. It is impossible simply because the world is engulfed in crisis—the organic age has been shattered. The question is how to escape from a decayed and collapsed way of life. Dostoevskii depicts precisely the problematics of this collapse. His final synthesis amounted to testimony for the Church. Vladimir Solov'ev accurately defined Dostoevskii's fundamental idea of the Church as a social ideal. Freedom is fully realized only through love and brotherhood, which is the secret of *sobornost'*, the mystery of the Church as brotherhood and love in Christ. This was an inner response to all of the prevailing humanistic quests for brotherhood and to the contemporary thirst for brotherly love. Dostoevskii diagnosed and concluded that only in the Church and in Christ do people truly become brothers; only in Christ is the danger of every harm, coercion, and possession removed. In him alone does man cease to be dangerous to his neighbor. Dreaminess is extinguished and illusions dissipated only in the Church.

In his creative work Dostoevskii took his point of departure from the problematics of an earlier French socialism. Fourier[221] and George Sand,[222] more than others, disclosed to him the fatal problematics of social life, and above all the barrenness and danger of liberty and equality without fraternity. This was in actuality the basic thesis of all "utopian" socialism, which the "post-revolutionary" generation polemically pitted against the Jacobin revolution, and all

"Genevan ideas" in general. It was not only a social, but a moral-metaphysical diagnosis. Utopianism, it is true, aspired to become a "religion," a "religion of humanity," but with an "evangelical" ideal nonetheless. In his period of social-utopian enthusiasm Dostoevskii remained and considered himself to be a Christian. His sharp break with Belinskii occurred primarily because the latter had "reviled Christ to him." As Komarovich aptly remarked, "the Christian socialist Dostoevskii departed from the positivist Belinskii."[223]

Soon afterwards his dreamy and bookish experience was supplemented by the cruel and real experience of *The House of the Dead*. There Dostoevskii not only learned about the power evil holds over man, but more importantly that "in prison there is still one torment almost more powerful than all others: a compulsory communal life." This was a refutation of humanistic optimism. The extreme torment here lies in the fact that one is forced to live together communally, "to be in agreement with one another no matter what." The horror of compulsory intercourse with people is Dostoevskii's most important personal conclusion from his experience in *The House of the Dead*. And is the prison camp not merely a limited instance of a planned society? Even if it functions according to the best regulations, does not every highly organized society become exactly like a prison? Is it not inevitable that under such conditions "convulsive intolerance" and dreams will develop? "This is a despairing, convulsive manifestation of the personality, a purely instinctive melancholy." The transition from *Notes from the House of the Dead* to *Notes from the Underground* was fully natural.

Dostoevskii now broke with socialist utopianism. Apparently *Notes from the Underground* was written as a reply to *What is to be done?*.[224] Dostoevskii saw in Chernyshevskii the dark, subterranean underside of the socialist utopia, in which he divined a new slavery. It became all the more clear for him that one cannot possibly be liberated from slavery in the name of external freedom. Such freedom is empty and pointless, and thus becomes subject to a new compulsion or possession. Possession by an idea or the power of a vision is one of the central themes in Dostoevskii's creative work. Sympathy or pity alone is not yet enough for brotherhood. It is impossible to love man simply as man—to do so would mean to love man in his arbitrarily given condition, not in his freedom. But to love man in his ideal image is still more dangerous. There is always the risk of "slandering" the living man by his imaginary ideal, stifling him with a dream, and fettering him with an invented and artificially conceived idea. Every man can stifle and fetter himself with a dream.

From humanistic dreams of brotherhood Dostoevskii moved on to an "organic" theory of society. He rethought the Slavophile and romantic themes (here undoubtedly is the influence of Apollon Grigor'ev. Yet this is not the fact of greatest importance in Dostoevskii's propagation of the "cult of the soil" [*pochvennichestvo*] as an ideology.[225] The themes of the "soil" and the "dream" are fundamental, but precisely in his artistic creativity. For Dostoevskii the question of the soil does not serve as a plan for daily life [*byt'*]. "Soil-lessness" worries him on a deeper level. Before him stood the frightening specter of the spiritual renegade—the fatal image of one who is a wanderer more than a pilgrim. Here again is the typical theme of a romantic metaphysics alarmed by the collapse of organic ties, by the alienation and break of the self-willed personality with his environment, with tradition, with God. And the "cult of the soil" is precisely a return to primordial wholeness, to the ideal and task of a whole life. For Dostoevskii, as for many others, it was a project for a still unrecognized *sobornost'*. Division is present in all forms of life, especially in human existence. The isolation of man represents Dostoevskii's chief anxiety.[226] All of the socialist motifs—the vision of revealing or creating an "organic" epoch, escape from the authority of "abstract" principles," man's return to wholeness, to the whole life—sound anew here. The similarity between Dostoevskii and Vladimir Solov'ev is much deeper than can be seen in a comparison of individual theses or views. However, one should not exaggerate their mutual influence. Their closeness lies in the unity of personal themes.

Dostoevskii was quick to understand that wholeness of the experience of life alone is very, very insufficient. A recovery of emotional wholeness is not enough—there must also be a return to faith. Dostoevskii's major novels are devoted precisely to this idea. He was too sensitive an observer of the human soul to remain at the level of organic optimism. Organic brotherhood, even when organized from within on the basis of some "choral principle," could hardly be too greatly distinguished from an "ant-hill." But it is true that Dostoevskii never surmounted the organic temptation. He remained a utopian, he continued to believe in a historical resolution of the contradictions of life, he hoped and prophesized that the "state" would be transformed into the Church, and in doing so he remained a dreamer. His dream survived even his later genuine insights, and clashed with them.

Dostoevskii awaited "harmony," but yet he foresaw something else. History was revealed to him as an uninterrupted apocalypse, in which the question of Christ was resolved. The tower of Babel was

again being rebuilt in history. Dostoevskii saw once again how Christ encounters Apollo; the truth of the God-man encounters the dream of the man-god. God struggles with the devil, and the field of battle is the hearts of men. Quite characteristically, history interested him more than anything else, even in his youth. He always had a premonition of a certain impending catastrophe, he persistently detected in history human anxiety, alarm, and, in particular, the anguish of unbelief.

Dostoevskii dreamed about "Russian socialism," but he envisioned the "Russian monk." The monk neither thought about nor wished to build "world harmony." Certainly neither Saint Tikhon, the starets Zosima, nor Makar Ivanovich was a historical builder.[227] And thus Dostoevskii's dream and vision did not coincide. He provided no final synthesis. Yet one feeling always remained firm and clear in him: "The Word became flesh." Truth is revealed in this life, hence this triumphant hossanah . Dostoevskii believed out of love, not fear, which separates him from both Gogol and Konstantin Leont'ev, who were constrained in their religious experiences by the same fear, almost a despair, that there is no escape.

Dostoevskii does not enter the history of Russian philosophy because he contributed a philosophical system, but because he widely expanded and deepened metaphysical experience itself. He relied more on demonstrations than on proofs. Of particular importance is the fact that he carried all searchings for living truth to the reality of the Church. The reality of *sobornost'* becomes especially evident in his dialectic of living images (which were more than mere ideas). With exceptional power he revealed the ultimate depth of the religious theme and problematics in every aspect of human life. And Dostoevskii's revelation was particularly timely in the agitated conditions of Russia in the 1870s.

Konstantin Leont'ev trenchantly attacked Dostoevskii, on the occasion of his "Pushkin speech,"[228] for preaching a new and "rosy" Christianity.

> All these hopes for earthly love and peace on earth can be found in the odes of Béranger,[229] even more so in George Sand, and in many others as well. Not only the name of God, but even the name of Christ, is often recalled in the West in this connection.

Elsewhere Leont'ev refers to Cabet, Fourier, George Sand once again, the Quakers, and the socialists.[230] Vladimir Solov'ev could hardly succeed in defending Dostoevskii's memory from Leont'ev's denunci-

ations by reinterpreting the "universal harmony" of the Pushkin speech in the spirit of a catastrophic apocalypticism. Leont'ev found no difficulty in parrying such an apology. Dostoevskii's phrase carried no such direct meaning, and it could hardly be taken in such a sense.

In his religious development Dostoevskii actually proceeded from the same impressions and terms of which Leont'ev spoke. But he did not disavow this "humanism," because in spite of its ambiguity and insufficiency he divined in it the possibility of its becoming genuinely Christian, and strove to bring humanism in accord with the teachings of the Church. Where Leont'ev found complete contradiction, Dostoevskii saw only a lack of development. To Dostoevskii's "fabricated" Christianity Leont'ev opposed contemporary monastic life or organization, particularly that of Mount Athos. He insisted that at Optina the Karamazov brothers do not confess according to the "correct Orthodox writings" and that the starets Zosima does not answer to the spirit of contemporary monasticism. Rozanov very accurately observed in this connection that "if this did not correspond to Russian monasticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, then perhaps, or even certainly, it corresponded to the monasticism of the fourth through ninth centuries." In any case, Dostoevskii is actually closer than Leont'ev to Chrysostom, and precisely in his social motifs. Rozanov adds:

> All of Russia read his *Brothers Karamazov* and believed in the portrayal of the starets Zosima. In the eyes of all Russia, even of its unbelievers, the "Russian monk" [Dostoevskii's term] appeared as a native and thoroughly enchanting image.

Dostoevskii prompted in many an attraction for the monastery. And under his influence contemporary monasticism itself showed a progress "in the direction of love and expectation."

We now know that the starets Zosima was not drawn from nature; in this instance Dostoevskii did not proceed from the examples at Optina. This was an "ideal" or an "idealized" portrait, patterned largely after Tikhon Zadonskii, whose writing's inspired Zosima's "Instruction" [*Pouchenie*]. "The prototype was taken from several sermons by Tikhon Zadonskii," Dostoevskii himself says about the chapter entitled "On the Holy Scriptures in the Life of Father Zosima."[231] Through his power of artistic penetration Dostoevskii surmised and discerned a seraphic current in Russian piety, and prophetically elaborated on that faintly visible line.

Rozanov's comments did not seem to mollify Leont'ev in the least, but only served to arouse him once more. Leont'ev was all in a terror. He was strangely convinced that happiness causes people to become forgetful and neglect God, and he therefore did not wish anyone to be happy. He failed to realize or understand that one can be overjoyed about the Lord; he did not know that "love drives out fear," and he did not want love to drive it out.

It is quite wrong to consider Konstantin Leont'ev a representative and exponent of the authentic and fundamental tradition of the Orthodox Church, or even of eastern asceticism. He merely wore a thin coat of asceticism. Again, how aptly Rozanov was able to define it: "A zealous encounter between Hellenic esthetics and monastic sermons about a rigid beyond-the-grave ideal." For Leont'ev asceticism amounted to the words of exorcism with which he drove out his fear. And western or Latin motifs are more readily detected in his esthetics (he has been aptly compared with Leon Bloy).[232] It is very characteristic that he was ready and willing to agree with Vladimir Solov'ev's *Theocracy*, and he strongly desired to openly declare himself Solov'ev's disciple.[233] He was attracted to Catholicism. However, Solov'ev's famous essay "On the Collapse of the Medieval Worldview" genuinely outraged Leont'ev as a reconciliation with "democratic progress." Leont'ev had a religious theme of life, but certainly not a religious worldview, and he did not wish to have one. His only concern was that his pagan naturalism not be imputed to him or classified as a fault or sin. In a strange way this pretentious "Byzantinist" possessed a wholly Protestant problematic of salvation, almost entirely incorporated into the idea of "responsibility," or rather "non-responsibility." How can it be possible to escape punishment or retribution for sin?

Leont'ev neither believed nor wished to believe in the transfiguration of the world. He loved this untransfigured world, with its debaucheries of primitive passions and elements, and he did not wish to part with its ambiguous, pagan, and impure beauty. And yet he recoiled in horror from the idea of a religious art. One must revere God on high....Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace.... Again, Rozanov observed: "In defiance of the song of Bethlehem Leont'ev, by then a monk, declared: the world is unnecessary." He had only one criterion for judging the world: esthetics, which for him coincides with fathoming the power of life. He searched in life for the powerful, the diverse, the lustrous–every "plurality in unity." In the name of this magnificence he frequently protests against what is good, and even against what is moral. "Christianity does not deny the deceitful and cunning elegance of evil; it only teaches us to struggle

against it, to recant, and to help us it sends an angel of prayer and renunciation." This is so characteristic of Leont'ev. He rejects evil because the Church demands it, but he also refuses to pass judgment on evil and even tries to infer that refusal without judgment is more difficult and therefore more praiseworthy. "Even if the heart is dry and the mind indifferent, a forced prayer is greater than one that is light, joyous, charitable, and burning." Most characteristic are the senseless (by his own estimation) aphorisms that he formulated in a letter to Rozanov not long before his death. He openly admits and demonstrates the discrepancies in both of his standards–the esthetic and the Christian.

The power of life is outwardly attested "in visible diversity and with palpable intensity," while "the more or less successful daily preaching of Christianity must inescapably and significantly diminish this diversity." In this regard Christianity and European "progress" actually lead to the same place. The world will tarnish and fade if everyone converts to Christianity. "By their combined efforts Christian preaching and European progress are striving to kill the esthetics of life on earth, i.e., life itself." Again, on the occasion of Dostoevskii's Pushkin speech, Leont'ev irritably exclaimed: "The final word!. . . There can be only one final word–the end of everything on earth, the cessation of history and life." This does not mean that history will simply end and be judged. No, Christianity itself will cease, history will be somehow paralyzed, and men will be deprived of power and passion. From this clash of his two standards Leont'ev knew only one way out: submission. "What is to be done?. . . Even at the expense of our own beloved esthetics we must, out of transcendental egoism and for fear of judgment beyond the grave, help Christianity." Such a poisonous compound, at once from Nietzsche and Calvin! And it is possible only in a deliberate ambiguity, in the twilight of intellectual conscience.

In his own day Solov'ev noted: "Leont'ev's hopes and dreams did not spring from Christianity, which, however, he confessed as universal truth. The universal nature of this truth and the impossibility of accepting it halfway remained unclear to him." In this regard Solov'ev, with his instinct for consistency, was the direct opposite. Leont'ev's most unpleasant trait was precisely this persistent penchant for ambiguity. He utterly lacked any innate moral instinct; the categorical imperative of "moral law" somehow never disturbed him. He possessed no genuinely recognizable anguish, and he also worried very little about truth. For him Christianity did not represent the light of reason–he never spoke about it and only very rarely did he

refer to dogma in general. Even about Christ he seldom spoke. In Christianity he sought not truth or faith, but only salvation–salvation precisely from hell and the grave, there and here, but not in a new life. Christianity as he conceives it nearly coincides with philosophical pessimism, with Hartmann's philosophy that "everything on earth is false and insignificant, everything is of brief duration, and reality and eternity will begin after the destruction of the world and all who live upon it."[234] Everything will end, everything will be disrupted. For Leont'ev Christianity is only a religion of the end–a prophecy of the end, and not a theme for life. Christianity has no "good news" about history or for history. Leont'ev saw no religious meaning in history; he remained an esthete and biologist in history, and was fully contented with that.

The hyper-eschatologism characteristic of the Reformation is unexpectedly encountered in Leont'ev. With all of his pagan, or "Nietzschean," inclinations and premises he suprisingly resembles Karl Barth. He is farthest precisely from the traditions of the Holy Fathers. For him Christianity is only the anchor of personal salvation; he tried to squeeze his entire religious psychology into the framework of "transcendental egoism." Thus, he could have no clear conception of the Church. He was too much of an individualist for that.

Leont'ev was one of those who had returned to faith. But this joyless, frightened return, largely with his eyes closed and, as he himself says, "against a whole storm of inner protests," was burdensome and difficult for him. He professed and believed with anguish, disillusionment, and sadness. Faith did not become for him a source of inspiration, but remained only a means of self-flagellation and self-compulsion. He was more a disillusioned romantic than a believer, and his image is so characteristic for that epoch of the religious crisis and decomposition of romanticism. He must be compared not with the older Slavophiles, but rather with such unrepentant romantics as Herzen and Apollon Grigor'ev. They possessed an identical sense of life: a fascination with power and space, an esthetic religion of the cosmos, a reverence for created nature (*natura naturans*). This perception of the world was not even guided by beauty, but by esthetic enjoyment. In general there is a very strong aftertaste of hedonism in romantic esthetics.

Leont'ev frequently refers to Herzen, and, indeed, the same esthetic critique of the shallow and faded West gave birth to both of them. Yet Leont'ev had even more in common with Apollon Grigor'ev. The esthetic reinterpretation of Orthodoxy in the Russian worldview, which is already so acute in Leont'ev and which becomes still

sharper among the neo-romantics of the end of the century and later comes precisely from Grigor'ev. In this perception custom and ritual prove to be more important and characteristic than either dogma or the teachings of faith. One might actually say with conviction that "life" is wider and deeper than any "doctrine."

Although he was confused and disorderly, wretched and miserable, Grigor'ev was granted "the joy or sorrow to give birth to his own ideas, not those of others." He was the same age as the younger Slavophiles, and like Aksakov and Iurii Samarin he was enraptured by Hegel when he was a student (under the influence of the new professors of the juridical faculty: Redkin, Kriukov, and others).[235] Only later did he turn to Schelling and dedicate himself to the "intellectual saturnalia" of philosophical romanticism. To philosophical influences were added literary ones: Byron, and especially the "whirlwind of new French literature," Hugo above all. German literature, in part Schiller and with a trace of Goethe, exercised a lesser influence. At one and the same time Grigor'ev experienced German idealism as a sort of quasi-religious enthusiasm and as a break: "He leapt across ravines and chasms." Fet, who lived and studied with him at the time, testifies in his memoirs that "during this period Grigor'ev passed in a single bound from the most despairing atheism to an extreme asceticism." At one time he belonged to a Masonic lodge and read mystical books (Labzin and others).[236] The echoes of Masonic songs and hymns can clearly be heard in his youthful poetry.[237]

Grigor'ev, however, did not possess a genuine faith. He himself admitted that "by Orthodoxy I understood simply a kind of spontaneous-historical principle according to which I had been fated both to live and to create new forms of life and art." Grigor'ev received the famous monk Parfenii precisely on esthetic grounds, and was attracted by the fresh imagery, the radiant impressions, the artistic control and completeness, and the "celebration of the soul" in his book.[238] The older Slavophiles, Khomiakov and Kireevskii, he greatly valued as bearers of the "organic" principle, and he ardently admired Archimandrite Feodor Bukharev's book *Orthodoxy.*[239] But he was always attracted less by an author's convictions than by the power of life he possessed. In the 1850s Grigor'ev was a member of the so-called "young editorial board" of the journal *The Muscovite.*[240] Among the other members of this circle we must mention Ostrovskii, Pisemskii, and Tertii Filippov.[241] Zedergol'm, subsequently Hieromonk Kliment of Optina and an ascetic friend of Leont'ev, was also a member.[242] The combination of a heightened romantic estheticism and a most realistic feeling for living custom, together with an enthusiasm for

Russian folk music, characterized them all. This was linked to Russian literature's discovery of the Russian merchant world. It was precisely for these reasons that Filippov devoted attention and interest to the Old Believers.

The very conception of the "people" underwent a change. The question of "custom" was posed differently, more historically and figuratively and less subject to pastoral simplification. After all, the "city" is a more historical category than the "village" (which is practically a synonym for "nature"). Grigor'ev perceived this historicity in the example of Moscow. "I need the ancient cathedrals, the old icons in their frames with their darkened faces; I need the traces of history and mores, even, if you please, the cruel and the common." Grigor'ev termed his worldview "organic," and linked it above all with Schelling. He had "an enormous mine of organic theories." A sense of the creative inexhaustibility and unbrokenness of life, "a sense of the organic bonds among the phenomena of life, a sense of the wholeness and unity of life," was fundamental for him. Life is wider than logic, more a poem than a system.[243]

Grigor'ev counterposes "historical feeling" and "historical conception," or, in other words, intuition and understanding, living artistic perception and the "despotism of theory." This is somewhat reminiscent of Kireevskii's critique, and still more of Herzen's. Incidentally, Grigor'ev had greater sympathy for "left" than for "right" Hegelianism—the esthetic argument was always the strongest for him. Schellingianism denoted for him a philosophy of universal beauty and a justification of the multiplicity, richness, and flowering of life.

> The highest meaning of Schelling's formula is contained in the fact that to everyone, to all nations and individuals, is returned the complete meaning of self-responsibility. It smashes the god to whom idolatrous sacrifices are brought, the idol of mankind's abstract spirit and development.

In accordance with his esthetic motifs, Grigor'ev insisted on a theory of constancy, or, more accurately, a theory that types or forms cannot be codified, as opposed to metaphysical transformationalism with its inevitable doctrine of "transitional forms."

The life of the world unfolds in the succession and combination of "typical cycles," and each cycle possesses its own face, its own form, its own image. Each epoch constitutes a distinctive "organism," complete in time, just as each nation is a complete entity in space.

> Every such organism, however it has been formed or however visibly it has changed in its traditions and beliefs from the original tradition, contributes its organic principle to the life of the universe...Every such organism is self-enclosed, necessary in and of itself, fully possessing the capacity to live according to the laws that characterize it, and it is not obliged to serve as the transitional form of some other organism... Unity among these organisms, an unalterable unity not subject to any development and uniform from the beginning, is the truth of the human soul.

Thus, a theory of cultural-historical types is deduced from the premises of an "organic" worldview. Herzen formulated a similar theory during those same years (see his *Ends and Beginnings*) and was also motivated by esthetics. Danilevskii subsequently demonstrated it in his famous book. The unrepeatable and unique attracted Grigor'ev above all else. Thus, the West came to possess a uniform quality. "The West has attained the abstract personality–mankind; the East believes only in the living soul." The West has congealed; the East is still fluid.

A convergence with Leont'ev is readily apparent: the identity of experience and intuition, the unity of the romantic type. Leont'ev went no farther than Grigor'ev in philosophy, and consequently did not surpass the confining limits of romantic naturalism. Esthetics always remained for him the decisive criterion in history–the criterion of uniqueness and power. Yet his theory of salvation remains an external and foreign appendage to his untransfigured pagan philosophy–precisely the dead end of romanticism.

Leont'ev's disagreements with Dostoevskii were not personal quarrels and clashes. A typical and fundamental question–the question of religious action–had arisen and agitated the Russian conscience. This question is always present in Dostoevskii as well as in Solov'ev, and still more in Fedorov. It is always the same: "How can I live a holy life?" Leont'ev agitatedly and irritably replied: "Remember death." He abandoned the rapacious wisdom of this world for life. But only at the end of the century did the next generation feel how deeply this decision cut.

XI

NEGATION AND RETURN

Negation and return are two sides of the same restless religious process into which the Russian heart and consciousness were drawn from the middle of the nineteenth century. In any case, it was a restless time. Against this historical background the full meaning of the philosophical preaching of Vladimir Solov'ev becomes comprehensible. He began writing precisely during the 1870s, and consequently his youthful chiliasm, apocalypticism and impatience seem less unexpected and peculiar. He shared the prevailing "faith in progress," although in a special sense. As L.M. Lopatin aptly remarked:

> He had an unwavering belief in the imminent completion of the historical process, and he shared the typical concerns of his contemporaries: faith in history, progress, the rapid and final triumph of all cultural ideals over life, and the construction of an earthly heaven corresponding to the peculiar religion of the intellectual segment of Russia in the second half of the last century. The faith that Solov'ev possessed in his young years, in an age of enthusiasm for materialism, contained nothing mystical—he was simply a convinced partisan of socialism. But then, with the general shift in universal conceptions, it acquired an increasingly mystical character, and merged with a transfigured faith in the Second Coming.[244]

It is necessary only to add that this "then" also falls within his early years, "in the dawn of a foggy youth."

As Kareev recalls, Solov'ev, like his contemporaries, read Flerovskii, and in the letters he wrote as a youth one can find specific hints of the spirit of religious populism.[245]

> The *muzhik* will soon display his real strength, to the great confusion of those who see in him nothing except drunkenness and vile superstition. Glorious and cruel times are approaching, and it will be well for him who can wait with hope, not fear.[246]

Solov'ev attentively watched sectarian movements among the people.[247] On his first journey abroad he became greatly interested in the contemporary religio-communal experiments in America, particularly the brotherhood of the so-called "perfectionists" at Oneida.[248] However, his only source on these colonies was Nordhof's book.[249]

For the rest of his life Solov'ev never fully lost this interest. In the first of his *Lectures on God-Manhood* he spoke precisely of the "truth of socialism."[250] In fact, his entire creative path can be comprehended and explained as a search for social justice. "Socialism appears as a historically justified force," although it is only the truth of a question or a necessity. Socialism's design or ideal cannot and will not be realized as long as it remains an earthly and human endeavor.

> By demanding social justice and being unable to realize it on finite natural bases, socialism logically leads to the acknowledgement of the necessity of an unconditional principle in life, or, in other words, the recognition of religion.

Moreover, in Solov'ev's opinion Fourier performed a great service in that he "proclaimed the restoration of the rights of the material" against a one-side spiritualism and idealism. His *réhabilitation de la chair*, in Solov'ev's interpretation, favored Christian truth.

> Christianity acknowledges the unconditional and eternal significance of man not just as a spiritual being, but also as a material being; Christianity affirms the resurrection and eternal life of the body. . . . Christianity promises not only a new heaven, but a new earth as well. . .

The design and "truth" of socialism are fulfilled in a religious synthesis.

Through his philosophical activity or preaching Solov'ev came to the conclusion that "philosophy, in the sense of an abstract, exclusively theoretical knowledge, has completed its development and passed irreversibly into the world of the past." Modern philosophy must be returned to life and pass over into action. "Precisely now, in the nineteenth century, the time has come for philosophy to move beyond theoretical abstraction, beyond the confines of the school, and declare its supreme rights in the affairs of life." The insufficiency

of "abstract" theoretical knowledge is, in Solov'ev's view, determined above all by the imperfection of the surrounding world. Empirical experience does not possess, and has not been granted, the true reality in the knowledge of which real truth consists. True reality must first of all be created anew:

> Of course, truth is eternally in God, but insofar as God is not in us, we do not live in truth. Not only is our knowledge false, our very existence, our very reality, is false. Thus, a true organization of knowledge requires an organization of reality. This is not a task for knowledge, as thought received, but for thought created, or for creativity.

Philosophy, in Solov'ev's vision, is "justified" precisely by its "historical deeds": "it liberated the human personality from the coercion of formalism and gave it an inner content." Before anything else Solov'ev resolved the problem of the ways of the religious life. He therefore called on all to study philosophy "as a good work and a great deed useful for the whole world." People listened to him not just as a thinker, but exactly as a "teacher" or preacher, even a prophet. The throng of listeners who attended his St. Petersburg University lectures amazed and dismayed the zealots of "positive" knowledge.

> In the sixties such a crowd could be gathered only for lectures on physiology, in the seventies for lectures on political economy, but at the beginning of the eighties nearly every university youth hastened to hear lectures on Christianity.[251]

In the social radicalism of his time Solov'ev perceived a quest for a transfigured world.[252]. He had a perfect vision of the spirit of Christ in the entire secular progress of modern times. "One cannot deny the fact that the social progress of recent centuries was carried through in the spirit of philanthropy and justice, i.e., in the spirit of Christ." He found a prefiguration and even an anticipation of Christian truth in modern European development. "If the spirit of Christ can act through an unbelieving church servitor in the Holy Mysteries, why can it not act in history through an unbelieving agent?" But this confused and blind quest for what is true must be brought into "the mind of truth"–it must be openly brought or returned to Christ. The Church must discern in this world this mysterious current of rediscovered truth, "raise it to the highest degree of rational con-

sciousness," and place it firmly in a higher and transfigured synthesis.

The theme of creative history is part of Solov'ev's perception of Christianity. Christianity is fully real only as a "universal-historical principle." Solov'ev firmly believed that the Church could attain its fulness and fulfillment only in historical action. And, conversely, historical creativity or construction first receives its real justification and support only in the Church, i.e., in the truth of God-manhood. "True Christianity cannot be simply a matter for the home or the cathedral–it must be ecumenical, it must spread to all mankind and to all human endeavors." The Church, in Solov'ev's understanding, is a historical actor possessing a creative task and calling in history–it is the sole genuine social ideal. "The essence of true Christianity is the rebirth of mankind and the world in the spirit of Christ, the transformation of the earthly kingdom into the Kingdom of God, which is not of this world." This was his firm and unalterable belief; the core of his entire system.

Solov'ev took his point of departure from the typical romantic critique of existence. He saw the whole world in a crisis or critical phase, i.e., in dis-harmony and dis-integration, in the power of "abstract principles." Everything in the world is disconnected and isolated. Even religion in the contemporary world is in decay: "it does not, in reality, appear as it should." Everything is so overwhelmed by discord that religion has ceased to be a "principle" of life. "Contemporary religion is a very pitiful thing. Strictly speaking religion, as a governing principle, as a center of gravity, does not exist. Rather, a so-called religiosity as a personal mood or taste exists in its place." These collapsing planes of life must be restored, and restored in their mutual ties and organic wholeness.

Philosophy must prepare or substantiate this great synthesis, this "total-unity" [*vse-edinstvo*], this great and new restoration. "When Christianity becomes an actual conviction, i.e., something according to which people will live and which they will carry into reality, then obviously everything will change." Solov'ev thought that "it is precisely its [Christianity's] imagined contradiction to reason" that is the chief cause of unbelief and apostasy from Christianity in modern times. Christianity does not "penetrate reason" to a sufficient degree; it appeared to the world "in a false form," and continues to do so. On the other hand, Solov'ev firmly believed and openly affirmed that there is no contradiction and there cannot be one–all of the postulates of a knowing reason and a seeking heart were first fulfilled only in Christian revelation. For this reason he attached the highest importance to creating an adequate form for

disclosing Christian truth, to the "justification of the faith of the fathers," through philosophy. In its entirety, his philosophy claimed to be precisely such a confession of the Christian faith in the element of truth.

A religious synthesis still remains to be provided; it has only been posed. "It is not a given of consciousness, but only a task for the intellect, for the fulfillment of which consciousness presents only uncoordinated and partly enigmatic data." The "mystical element" is only one component of this desired and proposed synthesis. The theological principle, one-sidedly developed, is transformed into abstract dogmatism. True, Solov'ev emphasizes, philosophy and science, accepted and developed by themselves, inescapably lead to skepticism, and a return to objectivity is possible only through a "mystical" experience. However, does it follow that philosophy and science may, or must, be left out of the system, or that the system of Aquinas or eastern patristics must be restored? Solov'ev answers this question with a decisive "no." At this point he poses the question: why, in history, does the human intellect so irrepressibly "separate itself from the truth of religious knowledge," even at the risk of rushing down into the emptiness and nothingness of a fruitless skepticism? To declare that all modern development is only an "arbitrary error," merely a "certain modern fall by sin," would be too facile an answer. No, traditional theology itself contains the grounds and bases for the falling away or apostasy of reason (a temporary apostasy, Solov'ev was convinced). Traditional theology does not include empirical knowledge of nature or give a creative horizon to reason.

> If truth cannot be defined simply as thought provided by reason, if it cannot be defined only as the fact of experience, then by the same token it cannot be defined simply as the dogmas of faith. According to its very idea, truth must be the one, the other, and the third.

The goal of the synthesis is precisely to:

> introduce religious truth into the forms of free rational thought and to realize it in the data of experimental science; to give theology an inner bond with philosophy and science and, in this manner, to organize the entire realm of true knowledge into a complete system of free and scientific theosophy.

It is quite characteristic that even in his last years Solov'ev still continued to understand the prophecy that the Gospel will be preached throughout the world in the sense that the truth will be manifested with such clarity that all will inevitably either consciously accept it or equally consciously reject it. The issue must and will be brought to such an ultimate and unconditional form of expression, so that it will be either absolutely morally or absolutely immorally resolved by a pure and free act or by a precise decision of each person for himself. "As long as Christian doctrine has yet to attain such clarity, then there still remains to be established a Christian philosophy, without which the preaching of the Gospel cannot be realized." This was at one and the same time a return to metaphysics and a return to dogma. It was also a reaction to every form of psychologism, pietism, and moralism. Solov'ev tried above all to awaken thought, to arouse the intellectual conscience. This was a return to faith through reason: *Intelligo, ut credam*.

In his historical expectations Solov'ev was a utopian optimist. "The unexpected will soon be realized." Toward the end of his life he was seized by an acute apocalyptical anxiety and premonition. But he waited as before: it will soon come to pass.

Solov'ev's creative path proved very rough, tortuous, and even broken. It was a path of struggle, not steady development; a path of enthusiasms and renunciations, an alternation of caprice and disenchantment. At various stages in his life he presented the meaning of his philosophical work in widely varying terms. In his early youth he resolved the crisis of unbelief not by returning to Christianity but by a conversion to philosophical pessimism, to the faith of Schopenhauer and Hartmann.[253] At that time Solov'ev reacted negatively to "historical" Christianity, and to every "catechism" he counterposed the still undiscovered "true" Christianity of the future. In those early years, under the dual influence of modern pessimism and Platonism, Solov'ev leaned toward that which he subsequently termed "transcendental idealism." Through the power of preaching he strove to demonstrate the nothingness of this world and, through the power of rational conviction, extinguish the blind thirst for this-worldly existence. The will to life must be done away with, the world must be destroyed. Theoretically his illusiveness had already been exposed in the light of philosophical idealism: "the world is substantial only in deception." But this apparition will never disappear without a trace. Solov'ev envisioned an apokatastasis, not a nirvana—a manifestation of the world of the spirit. And when, in *The Crisis of Western Philosophy*, the dissertation he wrote as a young man, he concluded with the pro-

nouncement that the ancient "contemplations of the East" are identical and harmonious with the modern "speculations of the West," he was speaking not of a philosophical "justification" of Christianity, but precisely of pessimism.

To the end of his life Solov'ev never freed himself from the powerful influence of Schopenhauer, which he combined with an enthusiasm for spiritual visions and mediumism. It is true that he very quickly moved to a higher synthesis, to the "absolute" idealism of Schelling and Hegel, with its intention of "justifying" the phenomenal world. But in actuality the pathos of these great idealist systems lay in perceiving and demonstrating everything as existing *sub specie aeternitatis*, i.e., precisely by absolute substantiation, or, in other words, by logical necessity. Solov'ev defines the task of metaphysics precisely in this way.

> Obviously the task leads to distinguishing the conditional from the unconditional, that which in itself should not exist from the unconditionally necessary, an accidental reality from the absolute idea, the natural world of phenomena from the realm of divine substance.

Through such distinction even the "conditional" becomes necessary, for actually nothing can occur without "sufficient basis." Every phenomenon must be "well-founded," for otherwise its occurrence would be utterly impossible. To once occur means that it could not but occur. It is precisely the "accidental" that in general does not exist. This pathos of absolute substantiation was always very acute in Solov'ev. He openly taught predestination, with which is linked the curious insensitivity to evil that he possessed to the end of his days. His earlier worldview may be justifiably termed "rosey Christianity," a very happy utopia of progress–"Christianity without an antichrist," in A.S. Volzhskii's clever expression.[254] His entire early "system" had been constructed on the premises of metaphysical optimism.

Strangely enough, in spite of his enthusiasm for philosophical pessimism his worldview contained no tragic motifs. This metaphysical complacency is more fully defined by an organic disposition–a perception of the world as an "organic whole" in which everything is proportionate and appropriate (note his doctrine of the world soul, which approximates that of Schelling). Thus, the entire world process is development. Incidentally, Solov'ev was a convinced Darwinist, not generally a transformationalist.[255] Evil, in his perception, is only

dis-chord, *dis*-order, chaos. In other words, it is the *dis*-organization of existence. Thus, surmounting evil amounts to the *re*-organization or, simply, the organization of the world. And this is accomplished by the power of natural development itself. "An invisible power draws the bright thread of universal life to the dark foundations of discord and chaos and arranges the scattered lines of the universal in structured forms." This is at the same time a logical and an esthetic completeness or plenitude–the cosmos, the "beautiful daughter of dark chaos," in Solov'ev's own poetic words. The organic whole actually cannot contain any superfluous elements, and hence there are no *un*-necessary elements. Evil is rooted simply in their disorder, i. e., in their *dis*-order or *non*-order. And, by the same token, evil is not constant. "The disordered, senseless existence of things represents only their false, spectral and transitional position."

Solov'ev accurately perceived the source of evil, and even its energy, in egoism, in the aspiration to be *dis*-united, individualized, and closed off in oneself from others. "The opposition of oneself to all others means, in practice, the denial of those others." And yet, in the first place, this aspiration to estrangement has not been realized, it has not been attained–the "involuntary attraction of uniting forces" is always stronger.[256] Sense always and unfailingly triumphs over senselessness. This inescapableness was manifestly exaggerated by Solov'ev; it takes on the quality of a natural necessity. For, in the second place, estrangement itself yields self-revealing meanings as a necessary prerequisite in this process.

> What purpose do these works and labors of earthly life have? Why must nature experience birth pangs? Why, before it gives birth to a perfect and eternal organism, does it produce only a formless, monstrous brood that is unable to sustain the struggles of life and that dies without a trace? Why all of nature's abortions and miscarriages?

Above all, Solov'ev turned his attention to this cosmic evil, to this formlessness in nature. He answered his rhetorical question with "a single word," expressing that without which neither God nor nature would even be thinkable. "The word is freedom." However, this word is hardly a single one.

> A preliminary self-affirmation is necessary for self-denial, for in order to renounce one's exclusive will it is first necessary to possess it; in order for separate principles and forces

> to be freely united with an unconditional principle they must first be separated from it—they must first stand on their own and aspire to exclusive sway and significance. For only real experience, the tested fundamental inadequacy of this self-affirmation, can lead to its voluntary renunciation and to the conscious and free demand for unification with the unconditional principle.

Evil is precisely a certain ransom of freedom. The fall of the world soul is the path to its free restoration, "and the goal is achieved beforehand, the victory precedes the battle." For Solov'ev fallen nature, the world "lying in sin," is "only another, unnecessary interrelationship of those very same elements that constitute the existence of the divine world," only a "transposition of certain existing elements residing substantially in the divine world." The existing is distinct from the necessary "only by its position." From here emerges a design for a universal synthesis, an ecumenical reconciliation or restoration through a new transposition. Solov'ev had an astonishing faith in every sort of agreement and transposition. This was not simply a rational conviction—he had a vital mystical experience, which in his early years largely meant an experience of speculative theosophy. The mystical or theosophical circle in which his initial worldview was reared consisted of the romantics, Jakob Böhme and his followers, and even Paracelsus and Swedenborg.[257] Study of the gnostics and the cabala was soon added.

Solov'ev conceived and even wrote all of his major philosophical works in these same early years.[258] In his *Lectures on God-Manhood* (even in the French edition) he is close to Schelling in fundamental intuition and in specific deductions. The influence of Hartmann and Schopenhauer is strongly felt in *Critique of Abstract Principles*, and Hegel's influence and method is always visible. Solov'ev's basic and fatal contradiction lies in the fact that he attempted to construct an ecclesiastical synthesis from non-ecclesiastical experience. This applies above all to his fundamental conception—his doctrine of Sophia. Subsequently he always remained in the stifling and constricted circle of theosophy and gnosticism. After the collapse of his unionist-utopian hopes and calculations in the 1890s, he once again suffered a very painful relapse of this dreamy gnosticism. It seems that this was the darkest period of his life, a "spiritual faint," a seduction by erotic magic, a time of dark and corrupt passions. But all the same it was only a relapse.

In any event, Solov'ev was always more firmly and closely linked to neo-Platonism and modern German mysticism than to the experience of the Great Church and Catholic mysticism. Particularly characteristic is his complete lack of sensitivity to the liturgy. He saw the Church more in its scholastic and canonical elements, more on the level of "Christian politics," and least of all on its mystical level, in its sacramental and spiritual depths. He had visions unattainable by the intellect (note his "Three Encounters" and all of his mystical poetry in general), and yet it was precisely in these enigmatic "encounters" and visions of "Eternal Femininity" that he was furthest from the Church. The *sobornost'* of the Church itself remained a closed mystery to him. He was too closely tied to Protestantism, through philosophy and through idealism and mysticism.

Solov'ev never traveled on the main ecclesiastical-historical path, but on a roundabout, mystical road. Of course he studied and gained a sufficient knowledge of the history of the ancient Church and the Holy Fathers; it seems he read Mansi more than Migne.[259] But here also, he was personally attracted most of all by the gnostics—he considered Valentinus one of the greatest minds in the history of thought, especially because of his doctrine of matter—as well as Philo, whose influence is always discernible in Solov'ev's interpretations of the Old Testament and in *The History of Theocracy*.[260] In any case, he did not go beyond Origen, although after being powerfully attracted by it he rejected Origenist "universalism." Thus, in a certain sense he remained in the pre-Nicean era, with its propaedeutic problematics.

Strangely enough, Solov'ev spoke much more about God-manhood than about the God-man. In his system the image of the Savior remained only a pale shadow. The Christological chapters in the *Lectures on God-Manhood* are completely undeveloped, which surprised and confused even Rozanov. This strange lack of receptivity or inattentiveness to the mystical sanctity of the Church, eastern or western, is striking. The mystical light of Tabor remained as far beyond his field of vision as St. Teresa of Avila or Poverello were from Assisi.[261] Even the French edition of his *The Ecumenical Church* hardly contains any kind of sober "catholic" sense of the Church. Instead there are theosophical deductions of dogmas. No real grounds exist for comparing Solov'ev with St. Augustine, nor can one rightfully suppose that he was mystically attracted to the Roman Church by a reverence for the Immaculate Virgin, a *theologia Mariana*. There is no trace of this in his creative work, including his lyrical poetry—a translation of a "litany" from Petrarch still proves nothing.

Quite characteristically, in unveiling his doctrine of the Trinity in the *Lectures on God-Manhood*, Solov'ev stipulates that he is not taking into account those details encountered among individual thinkers, such as Philo, Plotinus, Origen, or Gregory the Theologian. In essence and fundamentals their doctrines are the same. "As a matter of fact, the originality of Christianity is not in its general views, but in its positive facts; not in the speculative content of its ideas, but in its personal incarnation." Solov'ev actually backtracks to the point from which second-century apologists represented Socrates and Heraclitus as "their own," as "Christians before Christ." This is exactly how Solov'ev defines the role of Philo and Plotinus. Then he immediately complicates these same "positive facts" through speculative commentary. God-manhood has been realized from the beginning in the "eternal world," and the incarnation is only a certain manifestation of this eternal unity in the material and temporal world. The incarnation of the Word, in such an interpretation, is only a descent of the eternal Christ into the flow of phenomena.

> In the eternal, divine sphere of being, Christ is an eternal spiritual center of a universal organism. But this organism, or ecumenical humanity, by falling into the flow of phenomena, is subjected to the law of formal existence and must reestablish in time, through toil and suffering, that which it had left behind in eternity (i. e., its inner unity with God and nature). Then, for the real establishment of this inner unity, Christ, as the active principle of this unity, had to be immersed in that same flow of phenomena, subjected to the same law of formal existence, and from the center of eternity become the center of history, in which he makes an appearance at a specific moment: "in the fulness of time."

This passage is reminiscent of Origen, although it is more subdued and impersonal than Origen's fiery constructions.[262]

Solov'ev, in any case, had moved far away from church dogma. All of his constructions have a powerful aftertaste of symbolical illusionism. His symbolical interpretation of events and people does not so much heighten the value and significance of these sentient signs by correlating them with celestial reality as much as, on the contrary, depreciate them, converting them into some sort of transparent shadow—precisely a new demonstration of the nothingness of everything generated from the earth. All that is shown or exhibited in history are

only pale images or likenesses of things eternal. This was also the symbolism or allegorism of Philo and Origen. Solov'ev's every utopian failure, his every personal disappointment and renunciation, is rooted in this "illusionism."

Solov'ev was not, in reality, an original thinker, but a thinker of uncommon sensitivity. He always remained only a commentator on the great idealist tradition beginning with Plato and the neo-Platonists and ending with German idealism. And he possessed a great and rare Platonic gift for affecting thought. One cannot learn Solov'ev's method, but one can be fired with inspiration by him. Actually, he succeeded in demonstrating the historical "deeds" of philosophy and drawing Russian consciousness to the severe ordeal of philosophical meditation. All of his works represent an authentic and genuine response to the religious anguish and languor of his age, to all of this religious murmuring and doubt. They actually constituted a certain spiritual achievement. His whole spiritual constitution contains a great deal of chivalry and nobility, if not heroism. Even his desire to pass from the Christian word to the Christian deed is very convincing.

In various periods Solov'ev constructed practical schemes in utterly different ways. However, they possess much more that is essentially unaltered than would appear from a distance. He inherited from the Slavophiles the conviction that historical initiative and decisive influences had shifted from the West to Russia. He did not hold on to the dream of the ecumenical calling of the Orthodox Church for too long, but much more firmly believed in the universal mission of the Russian tsar. In fact, he reproached the Russian hierarchy for rejecting and forgetting their social mission "to convey to and realize in human society the new spiritual life revealed in Christianity." Above all, the Church must restore or rediscover its freedom, and in the spirit of freedom and peace fix boundaries between it and the government, within the limits of an indestructible but also free and safe historical existence.

> A council of the Russian Church must triumphantly confess that the truth of Christ and his Church have no need for the compulsory unity of forms and preservation by coercion. The evangelical commandment of love and charity is above all mandatory for ecclesiastical authority.

In particular, the Church must once more draw to itself the "best people" of educated society, "who are separated from Christian truth by the very dead and disintegrated forms that this truth receives in the current pronouncements of the Church."

Solov'ev's expectations and desires did not come to pass. But the events of March 1881 gave him a decisive jolt.[263] With full decisiveness and harshness he then condemned revolutionary violence and perceived it as a clear testimony of the impotence of revolution. Only a free goodness can be genuinely powerful. For that very reason he therefore expected and demanded forgiveness from the tsardom. At that time he generally held this conviction:

> In order that prayer might not be idle pagan talk, complete faith is needed in the power of the Spirit of God, complete dedication to God's most gracious will, decisive rejection of all outward and material means and instruments, which are unworthy of God's work.[264]

Solov'ev spoke of forgiveness precisely for this reason.

> Believing that only the spiritual power of Christian truth might conquer the power of evil and destruction now manifested in such unprecedented dimensions; believing that the Russian people live and move safely by the spirit of Christ; believing, finally, that the tsar of Russia is the representative and mouthpiece of the popular spirit, the bearer of all the best forces of the people, I resolved to confess my conviction from the public tribunal. At the end of the speech I said that the present distressing time gives the Russian tsar an unprecedented possibility to manifest the power of the Christian principle of universal forgiveness and, by so doing, to accomplish the greatest of moral deeds, which would raise his authority to an unattainable height and affirm his power on an unshakable foundation. By being merciful to the enemies of his authority, in spite of all natural feelings of the human heart, in spite of all calculations and considerations of earthly wisdom, the tsar would attain a superhuman height, and by this very deed demonstrate the divine significance of his royal authority and show that the higher spiritual power of the entire Russian nation lives in him, because throughout the nation not a single person could be found who could perform a greater deed than this.

This deed was never performed. For Solov'ev it was not just a socio-political disappointment, but above all a spiritual or mystical

shock. He lost faith in the Christian sincerity and seriousness of prominent people. Nonetheless, his faith in the ecumenical predestination of the Russian tsardom remained unaltered. It is important to note that this very faith was one of the main premises of his unionist utopia. Under the slogan "unification of the churches" Solov'ev actually preached a certain eternal union of the Roman pontiff and the Russian tsar–a union of the highest bearers of the two greatest gifts: Tsardom and Priesthood. Without the Russian tsardom the papacy itself cannot realize its theocratic mission, for the Priesthood can only find the proper milieu for its ultimate incarnation in the Slavic element. This, obviously, expresses his enthusiasm for Strossmayer.[265] After Constantine and Charlemagne there will be a third empire. "After these two preliminary incarnations She [empire] awaits her third and final incarnation." This is from the preface to La Russie et l'église universelle, in which he also speaks of the Slavic tsardom:

> Your word, Oh the people's words, this–the ecumenical theocracy, the true solidarity of all nations and all classes–is Christianity realized in social life, a politics posed in a Christian manner; this is freedom for all who are oppressed, a protection for all who are weak; this is social justice and good Christian peace.

This is also the "truth of socialism," now expressed in a theocratic synthesis.

On the theme of "empire" Solov'ev is reminiscent of Tiutchev and Dante.[266] To this may be added Solov'ev's Croatian impressions, particularly the influence of Bishop Strossmayer. Elsewhere Solov'ev specifically refers to Slavdom and Russia as "the new house of David in the Christian world." He described the theocratic mission and calling of Slavdom in the language of the Old Testament.

Solov'ev's synthesis contains still a third element: the function of the prophet. His early schemes vividly express the typical romantic motif of art as "theurgy." With this is linked the image of the inspired artist, poet, creator. "Great and mysterious art, suffusing all existing things in the form of beauty," was for Solov'ev the ultimate, crowning, and highest moment in the synthesis he sought: "the full truth of the world in its living unity as an inspired and Godbearing body." In the sacraments of the Church he saw the transfiguration of this natural "theurgy," hence in his conception the "whole esthetic" must become precisely a philosophy of the Christian sacraments.[267] Thus, the "theurgical" moment enters organically into the composition of the

theocratic synthesis. The task of "free theocracy" is, and its achievement will be, to transfigure and spiritualize visible nature itself. Under biblical influence Solov'ev mentally sketched out the image of the prophet. This, "as the fullest expression of the divine-human union, as the actual instrument of the Coming God, is the highest and most synthetic authority." The "theurgical" motif is always implied in his idea of the prophetic function. Thus was formed in him the tripartite scheme of "ecumenical theocracy," in which the threefold character of authority corresponds to the three tenses of time: past, present, and future. All three tenses are combined in a certain mysterious contemporality. Solov'ev had already developed his "theocratic" conception into an integrated system in the 1880s.[268] But its premises had been deduced from the utopian spirit of the seventies, when it had taken shape in Solov'ev's consciousness.

XII

N. F. FEDOROV: THE COMMON CAUSE

One other significant and very isolated figure must be mentioned in this connection: N. F. Fedorov.[269] In his lifetime few beyond the narrow circle of his adherents knew him as a thinker. True, he was in contact with Dostoevskii, Solov'ev, and Lev Tolstoi, and was able to attract them to the dialectic of his ideas. His influence on Solov'ev is especially noticeable in the 1890s, and in the design of *The Brothers Karamazov* one can easily discern his motifs–primarily the idea of parricide as a sin, in the light of Fedorov's idea of the resurrection of ancestors, as well as several others. However, his manuscripts were first published only after his death, and even then "not for sale." Fedorov was not a writer. Even for his own use he began writing down his ideas comparatively late, and all of his works circulated in literary form only long after they were written.

Fedorov can be most easily understood in the light of his epoch, in the dreamy and utopian circumstances of the seventies. He was a solitary thinker–he spoke insistently and often about *sobornost'*, but he remained a secluded individual. The most intimate currents of his thought contain this singularity, this spiritual solitariness. There

was a great deal of the eighteenth century in his doctrines and in his very personality. An archaist by experience and worldview, in some strange way all of the Enlightenment's too complacent, unruffled and happy optimism is revived in him. In this connection, no matter how greatly their views otherwise diverged, Fedorov reminds one psychologically of Lev Tolstoi. As a keen and subtle thinker, he could disclose genuine aporia and pose decisive questions. But his answers always contain less than the questions; they possess a certain rational simplification. Here was a dreamer. He always had more dreams than insights. Of course, he constantly protested against abstract theory and made pretensions of constructing a philosophy of action, a projective philosophy, but it is precisely in this "projectivism" that his dreaminess is most pronounced. A solitary dream about a common task–this is the basic paralogism of Fedorov's philosophy. His "project" approaches reality from the outside, as with some prescription, and a heteronomous one at that, which strongly evokes the spirit of the eighteenth-century lawgiver and philanthropist.

Fedorov can least of all be associated with the "cult of the soil" [*pochvennichestvo*]. A naturalist in metaphysics, all of his conceptions contain the categories of natural existence, and yet he himself remained "without soil." About the soil he only dreamed, and he had absolutely no sense of the actual "power of the earth." Fedorov lived his entire life as if he were not of this world. But he did not scale the mountains of the world to keep a vigil, nor did he withdraw to an inner desert to work. He merely fenced himself off from the world with a dream or an idea. Although he led an austere life, it might be more properly described as abstinent rather than ascetical. His poverty more readily recalls the ancient kenotics than St. Francis of Assisi. He restrains himself, shuns and stands aside, but he does not surrender himself. A very strong after taste of "non-construction" clings to his dreamy "projectivism," and his very humility or poverty is a distinctive brand of "non-construction." He steps out of the existing order, he proposes his own special task. One critic aptly spoke of the seduction of sobriety in Fedorov's worldview.

Fedorov appears to be part of the reality of the Church and of Orthodoxy in terms of what he says, but it is only conventional historical language. He utterly lacked any "intuition" of the "new creation" in Christ; he did not sense that Christ is a "shock" for the natural order and rhythms. About Christ he speaks very rarely and vaguely, in quite lackluster and unconvincing terms. Strictly speaking, he completely lacked any Christology, and his "projects" contain absolutely

no sense of anything beyond the grave. There is an explicit insensitivity to the transfiguration.

In a strict sense, Fedorov had only one all-consuming theme, one fixed design. The theme–death; the design–the resurrection of the dead. And when he speaks of death and resurrection his insensitivity becomes particularly striking. It is very strange that he saw no mystery in death; he did not feel the dark sting of sin in death. Death was for him more of a riddle than a mystery, an injustice rather than a sin. And he nearly exhausts the riddle of death in categories of morality and eugenics. The spiritual side of the victory over death he exhausts with the "resurrection of ancestors," the restoration of tribal plenitude and wholeness, the restoration of natural and psychological brotherhood. "Resurrection" here merely signifies a redirection and transformation of energy in nature, a rational regulation of processes. Fedorov emphasizes that there is nothing "mystical" about it, nor should there be. He imagines resurrection as a return to earthly life, a full restoration of the race.

Insensitivity to sin (which he defines simply as "thoughtlessness"!) distorted his every perspective. He could neither include nor comprehend the idea of salvation in his system. "To be saved" was actually irrelevant. Man has only one real enemy: nature, or death. Fedorov called for a struggle against it, supposing that man has the strength to conquer it. The enemy is only a temporary one. Nature is blind, and in its blindness brings ruin and death. As long as the elements are unrestrained they are powerful; they are powerful as long as man is weak, as long as he does not see clearly. But man is stronger than nature, he has been called to rule over nature, subdue and transform it into an obedient instrument of meaning and reason. And at that point death will cease.

> Nature not only begins to become conscious of itself, but also to control itself in us. In us it achieves perfection, or that condition which, when attained, will not destroy anything, and everything that was destroyed in the epoch of blindness will be restored, resurrected.

Thus, nature begins to achieve fulfillment in the labor and acts of man. Man has been under-created by nature, and he must himself fully create nature: he must introduce reason into nature.

The vaguest part of Fedorov's worldview turns out to be his doctrine of man. In actuality, he was interested only in the fate of the human body. Man is actually united to nature through it. But the

fate of the soul remains totally unclear, as does the meaning of death. What will die and what will resurrect–the body or man–also remains unclear. Fedorov scarcely refers to life beyond the grave for those who have died. He says much more about their graves and their remains. The entire phenomenon of death, as he depicts it, leads precisely to the fact that generations supplant one another, that life spans are too short, and that the totality of human generations cannot be realized all at once. In his view death is simply a natural defect, an insufficient development of nature and the world. "There is no eternal death. Our task and goal is the elimination of temporal death." Thus, the cure for death is natural, suggested within the limits of nature. It comes through the power of man and nature, unaided by any transcensus, without Grace.

> It must yet be added that the resurrection under discussion here is neither mystical nor miraculous, but a natural result of a successful consciousness of the blind, death-dealing power of nature, brought about through the combined efforts of all people.

Fedorov insistently emphasized the equivalence of this natural restoration. In depicting the "disharmony of human nature" he strangely recalls Mechnikov.[270] Both resolve one and the same question. But perhaps Mechnikov has, in principle, an even greater anxiety, a greater "pessimism," and a greater concern for the fate of the individual. Fedorov shows little interest in the fate of the individual person or organism as such. He is interested not so much in the culness of personalities as in the fulness of generations–the realized or restored wholeness of the race–in the resurrected world.

The doctrine of the human personality is entirely undeveloped in Fedorov. The individual remains, and must remain, merely an organ of the race. Among human feelings Fedorov therefore most highly values familial bonds and ties of blood. He explains even the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in this same sense.

Fedorov seeks the solution to death along the lines of a certain human biotechnology. He characteristically pits technology against organic processes and human effort and calculation against the natural power of birth. In nature he neither saw nor admitted any meaning, purpose or beauty. The world is chaotic and elemental, hence there is no peace in it. Meaning is brought into the world only through effort, not through creativity. To the living impulse he opposes a labor program–his own brand of a many-year plan. Man, for Fedorov, is above

all a technician, almost a mechanic, manager, or distributor of nature. Regulation is the highest form of activity. Reason must reconcile and combine the chaotic movements and processes of the world and infuse them with a rational conformity to law. First the regulation of meteors–then control of the earth's movements. We must literally become celestial mechanics and subjugate the cosmos through consciousness. "Once this problem is resolved, then for the first time we shall see stars and planets controlled by consciousness in the vastness of the heavens."

Fedorov sees in the fall by sin the wound depriving man of cosmic power and might. And in man nature itself becomes blind. The chief thing is for man to recover or restore power over his own body. Once again man must master his body from within, "he must know himself and the world enough to have the possibility to manufacture himself on the basis of the very principles according to which the human body decomposes." The ability to "reproduce oneself" implies a corresponding power over every human body and over matter in general, a "consciousness and control" of all the molecules and atoms of the outer world, for the entire world is made up of the dust of ancestors. The remains of deceased bodies must be extracted from sidereal distances and tellurgical depths. For Fedorov it is a question of collecting and combining particles, reconstructing that which has decomposed ("to reconstitute the bodies of the fathers that they possessed at the time of their deaths"). In general he wanted to rebuild or convert the cosmic organism into a mechanism, and he expected that such a transformation and rationalization would revive and resurrect the world and make it immortal.

> By directing through conscious effort the force of the terrestrial mass, a united human race will yield a terrestrial force controlled by reason and feeling (which is consequently a life-bearing force), and sway over the blind forces of other heavenly bodies, uniting them in one life-bearing task of resurrection.

Then the "paradise of labor" will be revealed.

Power derives from knowledge and consciousness, from reason. Death comes from nature, but life comes from consciousness–human consciousness. Resurrection is a human task, a task of science and art. The dead are resurrected by natural forces, the same forces of nature, only redirected toward new goals. "Man can neither destroy nor create anything, but only transform and recreate." Fedorov had in mind above all the altering of the natural and elemental forces of

birth, "a transformation of birth into resurrection," using erotic energy, birthgiving sex, for the restoration of racial fulness. To the act of birth he reacts with squeamish shame and abhorrence.

> Natural reproduction in Christianity corresponds, in a negative sense, to chastity, i.e., to the denial of birth, and, in a positive sense, to universal resurrection, i.e., reproduction out of that excess which is spent in birth and out of the ashes produced in the destructive struggle preceding living generations.

In this strange religio-technological project economics, technology, magic, eroticism, and art are combined in a certain seductive and dreadful synthesis. Solov'ev had reason to ask if this would not mean the "resuscitation of corpses." Fedorov had an undoubted penchant for necromancy.

Once more it must be emphasized that Fedorov always preferred artificial creation to birth, the artistic to the natural. The uniqueness of his religious construction does not lie in the fact that he opposes an "active" Christianity to a contemplative and ascetical one. He goes much further. He opposes human action to the divine, work to grace, the one in place of the other. The world is closed in upon itself.

> With a knowledge of matter and its power restored, past generations capable of recreating their bodies from the basic elements will populate the world and eliminate their differences....The earth will become the first star in heaven to be moved not by the blind power of the fall, but by reason, which has restored and prevented the fall and death. There will be nothing more when, in the conjunction of the worlds, we see the aggregate of all past generations. Everything will be related and not foreign....This will be an astonishing and wonderful day, but not miraculous. For resurrection will not be a matter of miracles, but a matter of knowledge and common labor.

With Fedorov's humanist activism is linked a conventional understanding of the eschatological prophecies of the Bible as a forewarning and precaution to those who pedagogically attend to the imagination and will of men. They talk only about that which would happen under the condition of human inaction. Nevertheless, for Fedorov this is only a *casus irrealis*. It is curious that he equates the "transcendent"

resurrection by the power of God with a "resurrection of judgment," a resurrection of wrath. In life, man can and must be resurrected solely by his own personal or natural power. Fedorov surrenders himself to the exclusiveness of the most extreme, optimistic Pelagianism.[271] His system reveals absolutely no doctrine of God-manhood. His religion is a religion of mankind, an idiosyncratic "cult of ancestors," as he himself insists. "The religion of the common cause" is his own definition. He taught a distinctive form of religious positivism, a subtle brand of "positive religion." Strictly speaking, nothing in it is altered if no mention is made of God at all (as is the case with many who perpetuate Fedorov's ideas).

Fedorov has been called a man of the Church. But his worldview– "in the majority of his proposals"– was not at all Christian, and he sharply diverged from Christian revelation and experience. His was an ideology rather than a genuine faith. "Christ is the resurrector and Christianity is the resurrection; the resurrection of Lazarus completed Christ's work." This is not an accidental slip of the tongue. For Fedorov Christ was only the greatest wonder-worker, to whom the spirits and elements submitted. The mystery of the cross remained hidden to him. "The very punishment of the cross and the death of Christ were merely the impotent revenge of the enemies of the resurrection and the Resurrector." Bethany, where Lazarus was resurrected, was for Fedorov greater than Nazareth, Bethlehem, or even Jerusalem.

Fedorov retains only an applied Christianity, without its basis. His "project" hardly exceeds the limits of the "too human." The source of his inspiration is not Christian revelation. He departs from other heritages and traditions to build a "new Christianity." His historical memory was peculiarly narrow; he built precisely something new. It is very characteristic that Fedorov has an unusually large number of similarities and points of contact with Auguste Comte's *Politique positive.*[272] One might find it no accident that Vladimir Solov'ev once again began to read Comte in the 1890s, when Fedorov's influence was so obvious in his thought. Direct allusions to Fedorov are easily found in his well-known essay on Comte. And Solov'ev manufactures a motif of resurrection for Comte:

> Comte does not directly express this thought, but whoever conscientiously reads through all four volumes of his *Politique positive* must admit that, of all the famous philosophers of the world, none came as close to the task of the resurrection of the dead as Auguste Comte did.

By the way, Solov'ev's designation of the resurrection as a "task" is hardly an accident.

As a matter of fact, Comte's thought had always been directed towards, or turned back to, ancestors. And the "positive cult" is above all a cult of ancestors. He contemplated burial and the cemetery with the same attentiveness and persistence as Fedorov did. The cult of society in the "religion of mankind" is attached to the sacred necropolises. Comte speaks directly only about an "ideal resurrection" in memory or eternal remembrance, most of all in the cult of the dead—in the harmony and concord between past generations and those replacing them. But by this he understood something more. He constantly thought about the revitalizing power of love. The "Supreme Being," before anything else, consists of the deceased, of ancestors. The Supreme Being acts through them in the history of a mankind still coming into being. The deceased rule over the living by the triple power of example, antiquity, and tradition. The line of ancestors is more important than the crowd of contemporaries. It is the guarantee of progress that the power of the deceased be strengthened. Continuity in tradition and time is even more important than solidarity or harmony among the living. Comte has a very strong pathos for historical "continuity," a need to integrate the entire fulness of previously experienced history into a genuine unity. In the positive "cult of ancestors," in the "idealization" and "adoration" of those who have passed away, one can discern a most acute need to encounter and be with the dead as with the living, a need to overcome the onerous schism between successive generations, to hold back the moment, to halt time itself. The ultimate "sacrament" in the cult of the positive is the rite of "inclusion" or "incorporation," i.e., the triumphant addition of the deceased to the noble throng of ancestors, to membership in "Mankind."

Above all, Fedorov shares a common theme with Comte, as well as that same air of pretension to "scientificality," that same naturalism or "physicism." Fedorov goes farther than Comte and possesses a good deal that is uniquely his own. But they have an identical "type" of worldview. There are still other points of convergence between them. Comte's theory of marriage strongly evokes Fedorov's plan to "convert" erotic energy. Solov'ev evokes Comte even more.[273] Fedorov's idea of organizing a perpetual "ecumenical council" of representatives of the clergy, science, and art has many parallels with the projects of Comte and even Saint-Simon.

Fedorov also has much in common with Fourier, with his "mystical positivism," where the motifs of Diderot and Rétif are mixed

together in a fantastic way.[274] Their dream relates the rebirth of nature to the resurrection of the dead, and this precisely through the conscious regulation of nature. And Fedorov, like Fourier, posed and decisively resolved the "heavenly transmigration question," the "transporting of resurrected generations into the heavenly worlds or lands that will be . . . recreated and controlled by the generations of those resurrected and transported to them." Yet Fedorov radically differed from Fourier on the theme of "kinship."

Fedorov's worldview took shape under French influences. He did not like German philosophy. In part he derived his pathos for social construction and "task" [*delo*] from French utopianism. All of his musing on the world's condition of "non-kinship" is an intimate reminder of the doctrines of the French positivists and socialists about "anarchy" (Auguste Comte), the weakening of "brotherhood" (Saint-Simon), and the "reduction" of life (Fourier). In all of these systems the principle of community and brotherhood, the principle of harmony and common labor, is set against the self-affirmation of the personality. Common to them and to Fedorov is the latter's pathos for racial fulness and wholeness. He always speaks about "Mankind," although under other names. Very strong bonds tie Fourier and Fourierism particularly with ancient magical traditions, and the magical tradition is again revived in Fedorov. To the end he, too, remained within the inescapable circle of magical and technical naturalism, of wonder working by reason and consciousness (a "psycho-ocracy"). No room is left in his worldview for free inspiration and creativity, and neither is there a place for mental effort, the spiritual life, or uplifted prayer. He speaks about the sacraments somehow in two ways. But the magic of the "common cause" is more real for him than the Holy Eucharist.

Fedorov's entire worldview had been afflicted with an incurable pragmatism; in the name of the "laboring consciousness" he preaches a most oppressive utilitarianism. The personality is subordinated to the "project." He himself speaks of the "burden" of his compulsory religio-magical "project." By freedom he merely means labor—with one's hands. No matter how much he speaks about the heavenly expanses and transmigrations among the stars, his system is stifling, it is spellbound by death. Fedorov had many brilliant and true ideas and made many sensitive hypotheses and observations, but he was more of a headstrong thinker than a bold one. He was often right in his criticisms and quests, above all in the demand for a "useful word," in the thirst for the Christian deed. But his truth was sapped from within by humanist self-confidence. He imagined a "task" that was seductive and vain. The brilliance of a dream is not the flame of grace.

XIII

CONCLUSION

The return to religion was at the same time a philosophical awakening–a highly characteristic and significant fact in Russia's recent development. It was not always a return to true faith, to the Church, or even to Christianity. Sometimes it amounted only to a search and an anxiety. The anguish was greater than faith. Nevertheless, the ultimate questions of being and action moved out with unrestrainable force into the field for sincere, intellectual attention, as we now know from the letters, diaries, and memoirs of the people of those generations. They found expression also in literature and in lyrical poetry. It is enough to mention the name of Lev Tolstoi (see his *Confession*). And Vladimir Solov'ev did not struggle for philosophy alone. Many other significant names must be placed alongside of his: Chicherin, Kavelin, Pavel Bakunin, Strakhov, Debol'skii, Kozlov, Lopatin, and the Trubetskoi brothers.[275] In various ways, and often in debate, they performed an identical and indivisible philosophical task. Theirs were experiments in creative assimilation, transformation, and transcendence of the great historical systems of philosophy–German idealism above all, in part a Leibnizian type of philosophical spiritualism, and even utopian positivism (note the influence of Fourier on Kozlov). This was an outstanding school of thought, which not only tempered the strength of Russian speculation, but also gave it boldness. The persistent philosophical preaching finally overcame social indifference, opposition, and obstinance. In the 1880s philosophy came completely out into the open and nearly achieved the scope of a social movement. Particularly illustrative in this connection is the history of the Moscow Psychological Society and the personality of its longtime president, N. Ia. Grot.[276] Aptly referred to in necrologies as a "philosophical wanderer," he spent his entire life anxiously passing from one worldview to another, nearly in a turmoil over these ultimate questions. But he always preserved the incomparable sincerity of a disinterested seeker.

It is quite interesting to reexamine year by year the yellowed issues of *Questions of Philosophy and Psychology* [*Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*], the journal that the Psychological Society began publishing in 1891, and also to reread the protocols of the society's meetings contained in them. In these dry, often intentionally dessicated

reports, the attentive reader can trace the historical development of thought or the philosophical awakening, the history of the movement toward or return to idealism. Solov'ev presented his *On the Collapse of the Medieval Worldview* there, and Lev Tolstoi read his *What is Art?*.

The flood-tide of speculative thought did not just suddenly happen at the end of the nineteenth century. It was long in quiet preparation. By the end of the century a philosophical environment had already been formed. Philosophy became a theme of social importance. And in tandem with this new advance an interest in Russia's philosophical past and philosophical ancestry came alive. Thus begins a third period in the history of Russian philosophy, one more curtailed than imprisoned by social catastrophe.

CHAPTER VII

THE HISTORICAL SCHOOL

CHAPTER VII

THE HISTORICAL SCHOOL

I

THE CHURCH AND THE GREAT REFORMS

The question of church reforms ranked among the first during the "era of the Great Reforms." Constructive proposals varied quite widely and were not well thought out. But no one continued to defend or justify the existing order. People of quite diverse temperaments and inclinations converged in demanding fundamental change. It is enough to juxtapose the names A.N. Murav'ev, M.P. Pogodin, and M.N. Katkov.[1] They all shared a common awareness of the "ecclesiastical lie" and the necessity of freedom and social discussion. Katkov expressed himself emphatically on this theme, in a report presented to the Minister of Education in 1858:

> It is impossible to observe without sorrow how indifference to religion steadily grows stronger in Russian thought. This is the consequence of those obstacles by which it had been hoped to forcibly separate higher interests from the vital thought and speech of educated Russian society. Whenever one can only repeat official stereotyped phrases there is a loss of confidence in religious feeling; everyone, against his will, feels ashamed to express it. Russian writers will never dare to speak in public with the same tone of religious conviction used by writers in other countries...The compulsory inaccessibility in which all the interests of our religion and Church are placed is the chief reason for the barrenness afflicting Russian thought and our entire education.[2]

Many at the time were prepared to repeat this harsh judgment, the Slavophiles first of all. The theme of outward and inward freedom was basic to all Slavophile journalism of the 1860s. As early as 1855, in his famous note "On the Internal State of Russia," Konstantin Aksakov wrote about freedom:

> The exercise of thought and spiritual freedom is man's calling. If evil-intentioned people who wish to disseminate harmful thoughts should appear, then well-intentioned people will also be found who will criticize them, undo the harm, and, making truth victorious, impart a new power to it. Truth, when operating freely, is always strong enough to defend itself, then nothing can defend it. But not to believe in the power of truth to triumph means not to believe in truth itself. This is a form of godlessness, for God is truth.

Aksakov writes, "truth, when operating freely, is always strong enough," but he implies far more: power lies only in the freedom of truth. The Slavophiles' demand for freedom was born from the firmness of faith. Lack of faith and fear are born from doubt and disbelief. Skepticism cannot become a source of creative inspiration. The epoch's strength resided precisely in this faith, almost confidence or optimism, no matter how naive it may have seemed. Yet the period was not simply confined to moods or undefined "demands." Precise desires were put forward from the outset. Quite characteristic in this connection are the notes composed by Murav'ev in 1856 and 1857 "On the Restricted Scope of Synodal Activity" and other needed reforms. Grigorii, at the time Metropolitan of Novgorod,[3] and particularly Innokentii (Veniaminov), then Bishop of Kamchatka and later Metropolitan of Moscow,[4] agreed with him. Murav'ev spoke of the formalism and the impoverishment of the bureaucratic spirit in diocesan and consistorial administration, and of oppression by the secular power. Freedom and *sobornost'*–independence in the Church–must necessarily be restored both canonically and practically, for truth bound is powerless.

Filaret of Moscow found Murav'ev's conclusions too drastic and hurried; he detected the hasty judgment of an outsider. But least of all did Filaret wish to defend the existing order. He agreed with many of Murav'ev's constructive proposals, particularly the restoration of the conciliar principle. But he feared a reform carried through from above, with the inescapable participation and assistance of that same

secular or worldly power from which it was necessary to be free. The initiative of Murav'ev, the "Russian Chateaubriand" (as his detractors called him), was not a reliable guarantee of genuine ecclesiastical autonomy and independence. From his former service in the synodal department and the over-procurator's office Murav'ev retained the habit of constant observation and outright surveillance of the activities of the hierarchy–he interfered too obtrusively in their affairs and work. Filaret himself frequently suffered from this importunance. Strictly speaking, Murav'ev had in mind only the destruction of the "Protasov usurpation" and the abandonment of the newly introduced "ministerial" manner in favor of the former collegial order, which would place the over-procurator's chancellery once again in the normal framework.[5] He gave no thought to the genuine independence of the Church.

Filaret generally preferred small deeds to sweeping proposals and inflated phrases, but not because he was excessively cautious or timid. The restoration of "consultative relations" among the bishops in a formally declared manner, thereby recovering the organic unity of an indivisible episcopate, would be a more hopeful endeavor than the hasty carrying out of legislative reforms. "Difficulty can be foreseen in gathering the hierarchy's opinions and acting upon them at a council, a thing known to some only from the acts of the ancient councils and completely unknown to many of them from experience." Filaret remained unconvinced that the Russian Church was ready for a council. As he quite critically evaluated one proposal: "The misfortune of our time is that the number of errors and indiscretions accumulated over more than one century nearly exceeds the power and means of correction."

For those of Filaret's persuasion N.P. Giliarov-Platonov's essay "On Elementary Public Education" proved to be an especially instructive case. The metropolitan himself did not hesitate to approve the article for publication in the academy journal.[6] It sternly criticized the years when the present order was established, when the clergy, in practice, became separated from any social activity or influence. "The Orthodox clergy is an intentionally humiliated caste upon which the state itself looks with contempt." Not surprisingly, the article provoked irritation in higher circles. Asked for his opinion, Filaret admitted that the essay was too polemically and incautiously written, but in doing so he emphasized that there were sufficient grounds to support the author's enthusiasm for sharp words. With great forthrightness Filaret recounted a series of instances that might serve as a basis for speaking about "contempt" and "humiliation." This dis-

claimer only heightened the original essay's caustic quality. In any case, Filaret expected victory only in direct and creative action, not in denunciations; in an ecclesiastical awakening, not in state paternalism. He considered the selection of people more important than outward reforms. Subsequent events only confirmed his fears. The reform, initiated in liberal outlines from above, proved a danger for the Church. Count Dmitrii A. Tolstoi's era was no easier, and perhaps even more difficult, than that of Protasov.[7]

II

ECCLESIASTICAL JOURNALISM

In the 1860s the demand for public discussion became universal. The rise and development of Russian clerical journalism was one of the more characteristic symptoms of the era. On private initiative journals arose one after another, in the capitals and even in the provinces. As a result, the official academy journals also were enlivened. In 1860, *Orthodox Review* [*Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*] and *Reading Useful for the Soul* [*Dushepoleznoe chtenie*] began publication in Moscow; *Pilgrim* [*Strannik*] began in St. Petersburg; *Handbook for Village Pastors* [*Rukovodstvo dlia sel'skykh pastyrei*], under the editorship of Fr. F.G. Lebedintsev,[8] and *Works of the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy* [*Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii*] appeared in Kiev. That same year the first journals of *Diocesan News* [*Eparkhialnyia vedomosti*] were founded, in Odessa at Innokentii's suggestion (later supported by Dimitrii Muretov), and in Iaroslavl on the insistence of Archbishop Nil (Isakovich).[9] Many other dioceses quickly followed suit. The journal *Spirit of a Christian* [*Dukh khristianina*] was issued in St. Petersburg between 1861 and 1864. In 1862 publication of *Spiritual Conversation* [*Dukhovnaia beseda*], begun at the St. Petersburg Seminary by Metropolitan Grigorii in 1857, was placed in private hands.[10] Makarii Bulgakov founded *Spiritual Messenger* [*Dukhovnyi vestnik*] in Khar'kov in 1862. With Filaret's sympathy and participation, the Society of Lovers of Spiritual Enlightenment was established in Moscow in 1863 as a counterweight to the growing nonreligious enlightenment, but only in 1871 did it begin to publish its *Proceedings* [*Chteniia*], together with a special supplement containing Greek texts of the ancient canons along with Russian translations and commentaries. The majority of the journals opened at that time

survived until the final catastrophe. Although they were sometimes interrupted, and not every publication was invariably alive and vital, the interest of their readers never diminished. Whatever the degree and character of their need, their demand for reading material did not weaken.

A general and exhaustive characterization of this religious journalism is difficult to provide, especially for the periodical publications. One can only outline a few fundamental traits. Above all, a constant demand to speak out can be felt—a need to pose and discuss questions. "Orthodoxy is not an affirmation of a dead faith." Particularly instructive in this connection is the development of the journal *Orthodox Interlocutor* [*Pravoslavnyi sobesednik*], founded at Kazan Academy in 1855. According to Metropolitan Grigorii's original design and proposal, it was to be a missionary and particularly an anti-schismatic journal.[11] But the entire plan was altered with the appointment of Archimandrite Ioann Sokolov as rector in Kazan.[12] The new rector wished to turn the academic journal into what we have come to call a "thick journal" [*tolstyi zhurnal*],[13] only with a strict ecclesiastical tendency. To a certain degree he succeeded.

In an academy address in 1856 "On Spiritual Enlightenment in Russia," Ioann developed a program for drawing closer to society and the people. The Church and the ecclesiastical school must move away from their isolation and enter the world, enter into the difficulties and interests of life. Awareness of faith cannot be the exclusive privilege of the clergy; life in accordance with faith is a universal commandment. Ioann wanted the academy to acquire social influence. As a preacher he touched with great daring upon all the timely questions of social life, beginning with the proposed emancipation of the serfs. He also suggested and proposed such themes to others.

True, comparatively quickly the Kazan rector's publicistic enthusiasm was put to an end from above. The Synod noted that the course he had adopted did "not correspond to the dignity of a religious journal." The journal of the Kazan Academy was demonstratively transferred to a department of the Moscow censorship committee. However, brevity of duration in no way diminishes the expressiveness of the symptom. Ioann himself did not subsequently abandon his publicistic view:

> The Church is ready and must be ready to strike all the bells a thousand times, in order to announce this hour to every corner of Russia, to awaken every feeling in the Russian soul, and, in the name of Christian truth and love,

> to summon all the sons of the fatherland to participate and assist in the great common task of rebirth.

The most prominent and significant of these journals turned out to be *Orthodox Review* (published from the 1860s through 1891), which was founded by three learned Moscow priests–Nikolai Sergievskii, Grigorii P. Smirnov-Platonov, and Petr A. Preobrazhenskii.[14] A fourth was later added to them–the Moscow headmaster A.M. Ivantsov-Platonov, but in those first years he was serving at St. Petersburg Academy.[15] Only in 1872 was he transferred to Moscow as professor of church history at the university. The first announcement of publication quite convincingly described the journal's goals:

> To asist in arousing attention in Russian society for religious needs and questions; to propose experiments or at least to testify to the need for a vital direction in religious study, which is possible in the realm of the Orthodox faith; and, in general, to serve as an organ for drawing clergy and society, religious study and life, together.

Thus, the themes of religious culture and ecclesiastical-social action were clearly formulated and posed from the very outset. The life of Christian truth "is not limited to the realm of religious awareness." "As a creative and life-giving principle," Christianity must embrace every aspect of contemporary life. The accent is shifted to social initiative and inner autonomy and creativity.

> In our view, the clergy needs to perform its own spiritual exploit of achieving greater self-reform, above all without governmental measures; within its own milieu and its own sphere of activity the clergy must become more deeply imbued with moral principles and with a spirit of social responsibility–it must be seriously awakened from its restricted life and come to an awareness of the social and higher interests of Orthodoxy.

Serious attention was given to correspondence from places of interest and to the letters and reviews of foreign colleagues–the priests in churches abroad (the essays of Fr. Konstantin Kustodiev from Madrid and Fr. Evgenii Popov from London particularly must be noted).[16] *Orthodox Review* was published under Filaret of Moscow's sympathetic supervision and protection. He had confidence in the basic character

of this socio-literary activity. Nikolai Sergievskii, professor of theology at Moscow University, served as editor during the first years, but Fr. A.M. Ivantsov-Platonov usually provided the guiding force, editing articles without signature. Subsequently, Fr. Petr Preobrazhenskii became sole publisher and editor.

A.M. Ivantsov-Platonov (1835-1894) was not a theologian in the strict sense of the word, nor was he an independent thinker. By calling and conviction he was a historian. He wrote little, but in the lecture hall he was an outstanding teacher. He also introduced his listeners to methodical work and led them into an immediate intimacy with primary sources. In the ranks of the Moscow University historians he occupied an influential and honored place.[17] His historical constructions combined a spiritual fidelity to tradition with the impartiality of a critical archivist. "Does not the principle of Orthodoxy in its essence coincide with the principles of historical science?" Fidelity to tradition does not reside in preserving ancient forms as much as it lies in the unbrokenness of progressive development. "In its essence, the Orthodox principle is precisely a historical principle of learning and life, for Orthodoxy in the true sense is nothing other than the living history of the Church, the continuation of ecumenical-ecclesiastical Tradition." The ecumenical must not be superseded by the local.

Ivantsov-Platonov was a man of very firm and powerful convictions. Scholarship was for him a religious calling and need, "the highest moral duty, a matter of conscience, a service to the living God." He had a very powerful moral-social pathos and believed strongly that Christianity depends upon its active realization in the life of society, not just in personal life. He detected the "way of the Kingdom of God" in the reforms of the time and saw in them the "year pleasing to the Lord," who is approaching in majesty. He was close to the Slavophiles, published the writings of Samarin and Khomiakov, and took part in Ivan Aksakov's publications *The Day* [*Den'*] and *Rus'*.[18] His first printed essay, "On the positive and Negative Tendencies in Russian Literature," appeared in *Russian Conversation* [*Russkaia beseda*] in 1858. He did not agree with the Slavophiles in everything, but he shared and approximated their spirit of luminous and true faith, the pathos of Christian freedom and Christian enlightenment. Ivantsov published his remarkable essay "On Russian Church Administration" in Aksakov's journal *Rus'* as a stern and penetrating critique of the St. Petersburg synodal structure.[19] In it he contested Vladimir Solov'ev's first articles on "Christian politics."[20]

A "historical tendency" generally characterized *Orthodox Review*; articles on history always predominated. And beginning in the earliest years a special supplement was published along with it, *Mon-*

uments of Ancient Christian Writings in Russian Translation [*Pamiatniki drevnei khristianskoi pismennosti v russkom perevode*], which included writings of the apostles, apologists, and St. Irenaeus of Lyons' *Against the Heresies.* Translation of the apocryphal Gospels were begun but halted. Fr. Petr Preobrazhenskii labored more than any other on the translations for the supplement and their publication. He was a philosopher in his personal interests, not a historian, and was attracted most by the searching thought of the fathers. At one time the question arose of inviting Fr. Preobrazhenskii to occupy (jointly with N.P. Giliarov-Platonov) the chair of philosophy at Moscow University. Iurkevich of the Kiev Academy was chosen.[21] In addition, *Orthodox Review* published the noncanonical books of the Old Testament, translated from Greek. The idea was to place the actual texts, not just paraphrases or commentaries, in the hands of the ordinary reader. The text was given in full without reduction or abridgment, which corresponded to Filaret's idea: difficult or confusing passages in the Holy Fathers must be explained, not omitted. "If an expression containing an unseemly meaning is encountered, one must find in it the actual thought of the father, which must be pure, and construct the translation according to it. One must be faithful, if not to the letter, then to the idea of the father."

The large number of participants and writers in the journal deserves attention. As a rule they were professors or teachers at the theological academies and seminaries or former academy students, and they either published their "course writings" (i.e., theses for graduation or for an advanced degree) or their "class lessons," and sometimes sermons and pastoral conversations. In this manner the dawning of journalism in the 1860s reflected the development of the ecclesiastical schools during the preceding era.

A link to (and even dependence upon) western books is detectable. Yet a vibrant interest was strongly expressed in the indigenous ecclesiastical reality, its past and contemporary condition, and in the life of other Orthodox communities. There seems to be an exceptionally large number of writings and essays on Russian church history in the journals of the sixties and seventies. This development is related to the general awakening of interest in historical studies in Russia during those years, an exacerbation of historical curiosity, and the general exertion of socio-historical searching of the time.

There were practical grounds for this. The question of reforms in ecclesiastical life and church administration was advanced and posed with complete openness. The question of reforming the ecclesiastical courts was raised with particular acuteness. With great ardor and

even heat all these questions were discussed either directly or indirectly in the press. The books published abroad in Berlin and Leipzig by the former professor Dmitrii Ivanovich Rostislavov and the Kaliazin priest I.S. Belliustin called forth special agitation.[22] Theirs was a bilious and hostile critique of the existing order, often accurate in its factual bases, but false and even deceitful in the nonconstructive character of its accusations. The full cutting edge of these accusations fell on the hierarchy and on monasticism, which lent the critique a specifically Protestant and Presbyterian style. This was an attack, not ecclesiastical self-criticism. Belliustin's ideal took shape under the influence of Protestant orthodoxy and a poor understanding of the example of early Christianity. It was his own brand of "Protestantism of the Eastern Rite," an attitude quite widespread at the time.

The principal aspect of the accusation made at that time, however, is less interesting than the social side. These debates of the 1860s reveal the differences among the various strata of the Russian clergy, the difference between the so-called "white" and "black" clergy. The term "black clergy" signified, above all, "learned monasticism," that peculiar pedagogical-service order from whose ranks the candidates for the episcopacy were as a rule selected. This was a western growth within the Russian ecclesiastical-historical body, a highly unsuccessful repetition of the western example under unsuitable conditions. "Learned monasticism" first arose in the south during the seventeenth century, in connection with the establishment of new Latin schools. It traveled north along with these schools. This modern monasticism broke away from living monastic tradition. No mutual comprehension existed between "learned monasticism" and the monasteries, and the difference between them sometimes reaches tragic acuteness. The eighteenth century was a particularly unfavorable time for the healthy development of monasticism. Russia's "learned monasticism," as a type, was formed precisely in the context of that enlightened age. The situation improved somewhat in the nineteenth century, but the type formed earlier remained dominant. True zealots and ascetics frequently existed among the "learned" monks. Such exceptions, however, only accentuated the entirely deformed character of the basic type.

The chief paradox of the fate of "learned monasticism" is linked to its organization under the authority and supremacy of the over-procurator. The nineteenth-century ecclesiastical schools came to be directly administered by the over-procurator, and the appointment of bishops remained the inviolable prerogative of that same secular power. This signified not merely the secularization, but also the bu-

reaucratization of monasticism: secular authority created the "order" as a means for governing the Church. In its essence, it was only a nominal monasticism. Except for its visible "image," or clothing, little that was monastic remained. This learned "black" clergy was all the less the bearer of the ascetical principle. Vows of silence were violated by not being fulfilled. In any event, for the "learned," monasticism ceased to be a life of obedience and spiritual deeds; for them it became a way to power, a way to authority and honor. In the mid-nineteenth century the "black" clergy was that privileged stratum of the clergy for whom the path to the honors of high office was opened and cleared through the power of celibacy. The difference between "white" and "black," colored and poisoned from the outset by feelings of personal humiliation and unfair preference, began in the realm of customary and daily life. With such an attitude the actual configuration of things could not easily be considered.[23] This was one of the most infected and dangerous wounds in the old Russian ecclesiastical-social structure. Mutual tensions quickly grew with the passage of time. The theme of "learned monasticism" was constantly discussed, overtly and covertly, but with unalterable agitation.

Somewhat later *Church-Society Messenger* [*Tserkovno-obshchestvennyi vestnik*] became the organ of a liberal and critical tendency in religious journalism. It was a weekly journal put out from 1875 under the editorship of A.I. Popovitskii,[24] one-time lecturer on French language at St. Petersburg Academy. Worst of all, the intra-class division was echoed in strictly theological work. Themes were often chosen with an ulterior publicistic design, as a justification of one's own practical ideal or as a refutation of another's. This is already detectable in the 1860s, when all questions relating to the construction or restoration of parish life and the opening of brotherhoods and similar societies were discussed with great attention. Especially characteristic in this connection is the activity of Fr. A.V. Gumilevskii, one of the co-editors of the journal *Spirit of a Christian* and the organizer of a brotherhood in the St. Petersburg Church of the Nativity of Christ (On the Sands).[25] This was the first open experiment in Christian social work. He met with opposition on the part of the secular administration, which feared excessive activity by the clergy, and his broadly conceived plan of ecclesiastical socio-caritative work was trampled down.

The Slavophiles also devoted special attention to social themes. The journal *The Day* sometimes contained quite bold discussions. Prince S.N. Trubetskoi subsequently remarked that these Slavophile plans for "democratic" reforms in the Church "more closely approximated some sort of independent commune than the Orthodox

Church." The momentum of the hierarchy was slowed, while that of the independent, almost sovereign people of the Church, or *mir*, was excessively increased. However, the people were not counterposed to the hierarchy as much as to the bureaucracy. All these questions acquired particular acuteness in connection with the emancipation of the peasants and the new organization of free village dwellers. In these ecclesio-publicistic debates perspectives were sometimes expanded and sometimes obscured by partiality, hastiness, and irreconcilability.

The supervision of the over-procurator occupied a quite unique place in these debates. Count Dmitrii A. Tolstoi became over-procurator in 1865, combining synodal service with his duties as Minister of Education, thereby seeming to renew the experiment of the "combined ministry."[26] This time, however, it was not in the spirit of a supraconfessional mysticism, but in the spirit of supraconfessional indifference. The "chief retrograde" in general internal politics, Dmitrii Tolstoi was, on the contrary, an ecclesiastical radical and innovator in the affairs of the Church. Completely foreign to the Church and scarcely a believer, he had no leanings or sympathy for any religious survivals. He did not conceal his scorn for the clergy and hierarchy. "The over-procurator's repression of the religious independence of the Synod finally became the established order of things under Count Tolstoi, and simultaneously the Church lost strength and the hierarchy became de-personalized."[27]

Tolstoi tried above all to weaken and halt the influence of the Church and the clergy in all things. This was particularly obvious in the organization of primary public education, from which the clergy was consistently excluded. (One should also note the reduced number of parishes–in ten years over 2,000 were closed!) The same tendency was no less obvious in the "Tolstoian" reform of the middle school, which was to educate new generations in the spirit of some sort of intangible "classical humanism." Religious instruction [*zakon bozhii*] ranked among the secondary subjects. But Count Tolstoi even attempted to reform the Church itself. Under his direction a series of liberal reforms was conceived for all levels of church structure. Apparently the attempted ecclesiastical court reform proved most decisive. Immediately after the publication of the Judicial Statutes the question arose in the synodal department: should not the church courts be reorganized and reformed "in conformity with those principles on which the judicial sections of the civil, military, and naval departments had been reformed?" The very manner in which the question was posed is characteristic: how can the reform be extended to the last "depart-

ment" still untouched by change? A commission was founded under the chairmanship of Archbishop Filofei of Tver.[28] Its work proved fruitless. Only several years later did the question of the ecclesiastical courts again arise. In January of 1870 a special Committee on Reform of the Legal Section was established under the chairmanship of Makarii (Bulgakov), at that time Archbishop of Lithuania.It was quite indicative that this committee was composed of secular figures and white clergy, while, with the exception of the chairman, not a single monk or bishop was included. The committee worked on its proposal until 1873, and then circulated it among the diocesan hierarchs for comment. Simultaneously, a highly critical review of the plan entitled "On the Proposed Reform of the Church Court" was published anonymously, although it was no secret that it was composed by A.F. Lavrov, a professor of canon law at Moscow Academy and a member of the committee who had remained in the minority.[29]

The episcopate greeted the committee's plan with hostility, and Archbishop Agafangel of Volynia replied with a detailed report on the illegality and harm of the over-procurator's authority.[30] The reform had to be refused. The basic injustice of the committee's plan stems from its non-ecclesiastical point of departure. Particularly, the question of introducing the "judicial statutes" into the Church's operation was posed as if church law and awareness of legal norms did not exist independently. There was also a hidden poignancy in the fact that the proposed reform silently denied the very existence of an independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction, especially one with full legal power. This was logical from the point of view of Petrine principles: is not everything in the Russian Church done "according to the decree of the Imperial Majesty"? It is true that the church courts and judicial procedures in Russia did need fundamental reorganization, but on the basis of the vital canonical self-awareness of the Church, not in accordance with prescribed secular norms put into effect naively and forcibly. It is also true that at the time this self-awareness was not sufficiently alive and sensitive–it had to be awakened. But this is precisely what Count Tolstoi wished to avoid. He acted fully in the spirit of the Petrine principle, subordinating the Church to all state interests.

The government's spurning of monasticism found particularly sharp expression under Count Tolstoi. Monasticism was a symbolic reminder of ecclesiastical independence and other-worldliness, no matter how much monasticism itself had been secularized. During the Tolstoi era the white clergy found broad access to influential positions in the Church, precisely for the reason that they were closer to the

world. Golubinskii's critical remarks are even more pertinent to the Tolstoi era: "The subjugation of the members of the Synod by the over-procurator is the dominance of a nobleman over seminarians. Should the members of the Synod come from the nobility and possess connections in court society, the over-procurator could not rule over them." The entire poignancy and power of the Petrine reform fully consists of such a conjunction of social moments. For that reason the government was interested in preserving in time the class character of the clerical rank. "We live in an age when, under the guise of a seemingly solicitous but insidious concern, the faith and the Church are being cruelly persecuted," Metropolitan Arsenii wrote as early as 1862.[31] This critical remark would be still more appropriate a few years later.

III

THE ASKOCHENSKII BUKHAREV DEBATE

The most notorious episode in the history of religious journalism during the 1860s was, of course, the celebrated clash between Archimandrite Feodor Bukharev (1824-1871) and Viktor I. Askochenskii (1813-1879), the well-known publisher of *Domestic Conversation* [*Domashniaia beseda*], on the subject of "Orthodoxy in Relation to Contemporary Life."[32] A great deal has been said about this tragic episode. The meaning of the clash, however, has hardly been accurately discerned. In any case, it was neither a theological debate nor an encounter between two theological trends, but above all a psychological and very personal conflict.

In his younger days Viktor Askochenskii had taught Polish language and patrology at the Kiev Academy. But he soon left academic work and the "religious department" in general. Such work did not at all satisfy him. From his "diaries" one can fully understand the reasons for his departure. He was completely opposed to monasticism and to every form of asceticism in general.

> When will the power of the anchorites pass into the hands of people who know the world and the demands of enlightenment? It seems to me that as long as these bearded philosophers orate from their professorial chairs–until the Lord

> drives out this unclean spirit of one-sidedness and inveterate, insipid quietism, until sensibility and expansiveness of mind are given power, and, chiefly, until the dreaded, dull-witted ferule is taken away from these black geniuses, who, (and this is not said in anger), are horribly myopic—until then do not expect anything good from our academies. Everything in the schools will be soiled, dark, insipid, and after ten years, and even more after twenty, our education will be a terrible anachronism.

Askochenskii says forthrightly about his teaching that in the lecture hall he spoke quite freely, but for examinations he gave notes as innocent as a babbling brook. He thereby shielded himself from "the irrational fervor of our inquisitor-monks." And he actually succeeded in camouflaging himself.

> Once, while writing a lecture, I thought: "What need do I have of the sanctity of so and so?...I read his writings and analyze them as a critic, and not as an awe-struck worshipper glorifying God and the saints."For this reason the reader may find a great deal of boldness in my memoirs, and perhaps he may suspect me of blasphemy.

Askochenskii relates negatively not only to "learned monasticism," but precisely to asceticism itself, to fasting, and to every form of ancient church rite, including Orthodox ritual.

> Today, times have changed. Brawling will not resolve differences of opinion regarding this or that dogma. You believe one thing and I believe another; you accept something and I don't—so what? For the free man there is choice; for the one who is saved there is heaven. But fighting gets us nowhere, and the same goes for curses.

Askochenskii was always inclined to freethinking. He always felt a special attraction to and interest in "poor Judas," whom he considered innocently slandered. Psychologically, Askochenskii most closely resembles the well-known figure Rostislavov, regardless of how much their practical conclusions differed. They share the same irritability and a certain rancor in their judgments. Failures in life irritated Askochenskii—he felt overcome by his environment. He had experienced almost complete poverty, and as a youth his family happiness

was twice destroyed. He emerged from these ordeals cruel and full of bile. In the 1850s he entered the world of journalism as an ardent conservative, but he became a conservative through a bilious lack of faith. What he defended was custom and the civil order, rather than a church tradition that he did not know. He guarded and defended the established order out of a deep mistrust of people. He took no part of an "ascetical" worldview, and only pretended to be its defender. All of reality he accepted melodramatically, as a play of light and darkness; all around him he detected evil-intentioned people.

The outburst of nihilism and radicalism at the time seemed to justify his deep distrust. Only in this way can his literary success be explained. *Domestic Conversation* provided many readers with bitter and nasty antidotes to the "radical" journalism, which at the time was also being carried on by emigres from the "religious department" and the ecclesiastical schools. Askochenskii's vulgarity itself is not surprising, given the stultifying circumstances of the prevailing "polemical eloquence" and all those "catcalls of education." Yet not everyone who found satisfaction in his polemics should be considered of a like mind with him. Too much of his polemic can only be understood from the personal temperament of the polemist. Askochenskii did not believe in empirical goodness, and Archimandrite Feodor's good and trusting nature, his desire to do good, irritated him more than anything. The monastic cassock itself possibly bothered him.

Fr. Feodor Bukharev can in no way be considered one of the "new men." His spiritual temperament places him fully in the epoch of Alexandrian mysticism. He was rather behind his times, and his personal tragedy and destruction are bound up with that fact. From his early youth Bukharev was seized by a will to action; he felt an insurmountable need to build a new world and a new life. He received tonsure precisely for this reason, "in order not to remain a private in Christ's army." He became a monk and a priest in order to open new roads in the world and to widen the field of his possible influence on life. As he himself explained, monasticism to him meant service, i.e., precisely action and influence. But he utterly lacked a sensitivity and receptivity for the active life. He had little understanding of it and was unable to learn. Worldly vision exceeded his capacity; he was unsuited precisely to direct action. Inescapably he developed a utopian dreaminess, and the stubbornness of a visionary awoke—a quality still more pronounced in his fateful book *Investigations of the Apocalypse* [*Izsledovaniia apokalipsisa*].[33]

Fr. Feodor completely lacked any sense of historical perspective; he felt none of the rhythm and inertia of history. For him all dates

were too attenuated. His explanation of historical events is not very convincing. He was simply not a historian. He had a poor knowledge of history, and traced the historical process from random textbooks. In Giliarov-Platonov's words, "Feodor explains the fate of the world with copies of the Apocalypse and Lorents in his hands."[34] Here one may also repeat Filaret's remark, delivered on a different occasion about another experiment in the apocalyptical frame of mind: "several vague apocalyptical phenomena have been forcibly redirected to the world and the divine has been transformed into the political." His book contains much more that is artificial than is genuinely perceived. Even after a later revision the book remained lackluster; very few luminous pages are to be found in it. And for this reason Archimandrite Feodor's fatal response to the censor's suppression of the book becomes still more tragic. Renunciation of the priesthood–first the breaking of his monastic vows and then marriage–was in no way a "heroic act of confession," but rather a convulsion of dreamy perplexity, a genuine mystical suicide, which was particularly terrible for a preacher of the Lamb of God. It was a convulsive and impotent protest of a utopian fantasy against the tragic complexity of life.

Bukharev left monasticism in order to seek for himself new and better ways of service and action. His self-deception proved still more tragic in that he found no other way–nor could he find one, for he simply did not see what was going on around him. He could not and did not wish to see it. He was precisely incapable of being a publicist. Everything he wrote at the time about radical and negative journalism is striking for its naive blindness, for its inability to grasp the concrete contours of things. Hence he could not resolve the task with which he was occupied his entire life: the great goal of bringing all of life into the Church. It was Fr. Feodor's undoubted service that he advanced this task through his teaching and instruction. But he weakened the force of his own message. His personal decisions were so often confused precisely by this blind naivete and lack of serious resolve. Bukharev was not simply a utopian–he was a very naive one. His strength lay in his sincerity, but too often his sincerity itself was exaggerated and strained. He had no spiritual sense of proportion, and he was always spiritually agitated. "Difficult breathing, a breaking voice, an unusual gloss in the eyes...." He captivated and aroused his audience, but never succeeded in carrying it away. He was always only "for the occasion."[35]

Bukharev studied at the Moscow Academy, where he first became a teacher; he then became a professor and inspector at Kazan. Among the academy teachers he was most indebted to Fr. Fedor Golubinskii,

from whom he learned about German philosophy and theosophy. Among outside influences, he himself mentions Belinskii's essays, from which he derived philosophical ideas and transposed them "onto a different foundation," i.e., onto Christ. Gogol's books, especially the *Selected Correspondence,* produced a powerful impression on him. Later he was strongly influenced by the Uglich priest and "fool for Christ" Fr. Petr Tomanitskii, whom he considered a "mighty spiritual leader."[36] But, as he himself always admitted, his views were closest to those of Filaret of Moscow. The basic design of his "system," the entire doctrine of the love of the cross, was borrowed from Filaret. Even his fateful book about the Apocalypse was conceived not without Filaret's indirect influence. The Apocalypse was the Moscow metropolitan's favorite text. And in general Filaret actually approved of Bukharev's book: "A glimmer of light can be seen...." And yet he was quite right in insisting that it does not follow that such a naive book should be published.

Bukharev's worldview had a certain grandeur, but it was only a sweep of the imagination. In this respect he bears little resemblance to Filaret, who possessed an imagination tempered by an ascetic fire and a rejoicing heart, from which the plasticity and measured quality of his meditations are derived. It was precisely this quality which was absent in Bukharev. He understood everything too straightforwardly and therefore schematically. One always detects the dominance of dream over reality in his depictions. Filaret may be called a tragic *oikonomist*; Bukharev an *akrivist*—a utopian of *akrivia*.[37]

Basic to Bukharev's worldview is the very illuminating experience of an unfolding salvation. The Lamb of God has accepted and removed the sin of the world; the barrier of sinfulness has been smashed and destroyed. Bukharev's wholly unrestrained optimism and joy at reconciliation stem from this belief. In Christian experience sinfulness loses its sting, the heart overflows with the feeling of God's redeeming mercy. One must become a crusader, suffer with the Lamb, co-experience and, as it were, take upon oneself all the sinfulness and faults of others. Only through such common suffering, only through the power of such a compassionate love is it possible to enter into the power of the blessing of the Father and the love of the Lamb. Hence an acute sense of Christian responsibility for life arises. By the power of the immutable incarnation, in the image of the God-man, each and every human deed or act has been assigned a higher purpose.

God the Word, in Bukharev's view, is the Lamb of God. Trinitarian love is fully revealed in the Only-Begotten Son. Through him it is poured into the world. The emptying of the Word and his slaughter

begins from the very creation of the world, for he took upon himself all the contradictions and disorders of the existing world. The entire sinful life of the world is the uninterrupted slaughter of the Lamb. Only his sacrificial love preserves the world. This emptying is completed in the redemptive incarnation. The sacrifice of the Lamb is fulfilled by death on the cross, and through its power, in the fulness of the Church, the entire mortal composition of being is enfused with life. This outline was boldly and attractively constructed, but everything about it lacks sufficient concreteness. Only general definitions are ever given. There is a notable penchant for sentimental quietism. Bukharev's crusade took place more in the realm of sympathetic imagination than in real spiritual exploits. He could not endure his own struggles. He renounced his vows, entered into a marriage that broke his pledge, and abandoned the priesthood–all in the name of a pretentious and dreamy activism. Bukharev lacked creative force; he had no ascetical courage. He could not bear his own cross, and hence his collapse. His is an agitated image, but certainly not a prophetic or heroic one.

The quarrel with Askochenskii was bound up with contemporary events. Both men, strictly speaking, were wrong–Askochenskii through his skeptical invective; Fr. Feodor because of his sentimental geniality. His truth lay only in seeking a way out and firmly hoping that it could be found, although he mistook a blind alley for this way out. The Askochenskii-Bukharev debate was a clash between stagnation and dreaminess. It could be resolved only along other lines.

IV

THE RUSSIAN BIBLE

Filaret of Moscow made use of the changing circumstances at the very outset of the reign of Alexander II to advance the matter of the suspended translation of the Bible. On the occasion of the new tsar's coronation in 1856, the Holy Synod temporarily transferred its meetings to Moscow, which once again, after a very long interruption, gave Filaret the opportunity of taking a personal part in synodal affairs. In Moscow, at his suggestion and urging, it considered among

other things "providing the Orthodox people with the means to read Holy Scripture for instruction in the home and with the easiest possible comprehension." The Synod unanimously accepted the proposal to renew the translation of the Holy Scriptures, and Filaret was charged with formulating the decision in its final form. A new over-procurator, Count A.P. Tolstoi (an intimate friend of Gogol's), was appointed at that time. A man of "Optina Orthodoxy," in Giliarov-Platonov's characterization, Count Tolstoi was little disposed to any "reforms" in the Church, or to academic education in general. He especially opposed biblical translation, just as had the Metropolitan of Kiev, Filaret (Amfiteatrov), not long before.[38]

After receiving a draft of the decision from Filaret of Moscow the over-procurator added his own personal opinion and, counting on a negative report, sent it to Kiev rather than submit it to the Synod. A sharply worded and caustic answer quickly returned from Kiev.[39] By comparison with the opinions of 1824 and 1842 it contained little that was new: the same fear of the "vernacular," the same mistrust of the Hebrew Bible, "which is unknown in the Church," the same dread of the earlier "impious" translations of Pavskii and Makarii.[40] But one new fear was added. After the Holy Scriptures were translated, would not someone conceive of the idea of arguing in favor of translating the liturgical books? The Russian language cannot be compared in expressiveness with the Slavonic, and therefore it would be better to undertake corrections of the Slavonic text. Commentaries taken from the Holy Fathers could be usefully published, and at the same time Slavonic instruction could be generally strengthened in all schools, both ecclesiastical and secular, thereby eliminating the contention that a Russian translation is justified by ignorance of Slavonic. A new translation could not be determined upon "without the consent of the Greek Church," which itself does not allow the transposition of the Bible into the vulgar modern Greek. Would not the idea arise that the Russian Church is departing from the ancient heritage of the First Teachers of the Slavs? Even the business of correcting the Slavonic Bible would be better entrusted to people "completely free from educational occupations" rather than to academy professors; to people "suitable not only by education, but by piety as well."

The very idea of a Russian translation arose from a tainted source:

> This idea was not born from the Russian Church, the hierarchy, nor the people, but rather from the very same source as the idea of a modern Greek translation: England–that

> little nest of all heresies, sects, and revolution. From there it was transmitted by the Bible Societies, which were originally accepted not in the Synod but in the chancellery of the over-procurator, and which grew to huge dimensions under the former Ministry of Religious Affairs. Such a beginning, and equally its outcome, clearly shows that there was no blessing on it from on high.

In conclusion, the Kiev metropolitan entrusted all of this worrisome business to the over-procurator's "judicious judgment," in the hope that the "autocratic word" of the sovereign would halt the unpromising enterprise. The tsar, however, directed that the opinion of the Moscow bishop be consulted and all material then be discussed in the Synod. Filaret of Moscow replied to the Kiev metropolitan's note decisively and calmly, but not without bitterness.

Yet it was only after the Kiev metropolitan's death in December of 1857 that the translation of the Bible officially moved forward. A synodal directive was drawn up between January 24 and March 20 of 1858, and an imperial ukase renewing the translation was published in May. Subsequently, as a kind of directive to get the matter underway, Filaret of Moscow published his "note" of 1845. The New Testament translation was resumed, all the academies were once again brought in on the project, while the editorial work was given to the St. Petersburg professor Evgraf I. Loviagin.[41] A higher and final examination was entrusted to Filaret. Despite his advanced age he very actively participated in the work, attentively rereading and verifying all the material. The Russian Gospels were published in 1860, followed in 1862 by the entire New Testament.

Translation of the Old Testament required more time. As early as the outset of the 1860s private attempts at translating individual books began to appear in various religious journals. The recently suppressed translations of Pavskii and Makarii were the first to be published–a vital and clear sign of progress and change.[42] It was admitted that these efforts must necessarily and usefully be given publicity in order that by free discussion in the press a final edition might be prepared. To this end professors in the academies were told to busy themselves with translations of the individual books, so that in due course these new experiments could be used by the synodal commission. Fr. Makarii (Glukharev) in his own day had made a similar proposal, that the St. Petersburg Academy publish a special journal entitled *Experiments in Translation from Hebrew and Greek* [*Opyty v perevode s evreiskago i grecheskago*] and circulate it with comments

and notes among the academies and seminaries. This material would have proved useful.

During those years translations of many books appeared in the academy publications *Christian Reading* and *Works of the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy*. In Kiev Professor Mikhail S. Guliaev worked with particular diligence, as did Professor Moisei A. Golubev, together with Pavel I. Savvaitov, Daniil A. Khvol'son, and others in St. Petersburg.[43] Individual editions began to appear. Porfirii Uspenskii, then Bishop of Chigirin, published his own biblical translations (from the Greek).[44] This marked a complete break from the regime of the reign of the previous tsar.

Difficulties, however, were met with, and the question of the principles of translation was not immediately and successfully resolved. The opinion was advanced that the Old Testament must also be translated from the Greek. Metropolitan Grigorii became inclined to this opinion. Filaret of Moscow insisted that the translation be made according to a collation of both texts, with discrepancies between them in the most important places noted. At first the intention was to begin with the Psalter, and Filaret himself, in his last years, worked on the correction of the translation of the Psalms. Filaret, however, then proposed that the text be published in its usual order, noting that even the language of the Pentateuch is easier than that of the Psalter. The Synod's translation began to appear in 1868, in separate volumes, and the full edition (with the inclusion of the "non-canonical" books) was finished in 1875.

The Synod's edition was not received favorably by all. Many were disturbed by divergences from the usual Slavonic text. In other words, preference had been given to the Hebrew Bible. To many this seemed to be a direct deviation from tradition. The basic argument in favor of the Septuagint was usually that advanced by Konstantin Ikonomos.[45] Even Dimitrii Muretov, for the sake of unity with the contemporary Greek Church, favored translation from the Greek. He thought that if the Hebrew and Greek texts were to be collated and considered together "the result would be not a translation, but a new book." Bishop Feofan (Govorov), at that time a monk who had taken a vow to remain in his cell and see no one [*zatvornik*], proved to be an especially critical opponent of the Hebrew text.[46] He termed the new Russian translation of the Old Testament a "synodal composition," just as Afanasii had, and he dreamt "that this newfangled Bible had been brought to St. Isaac's Square to be burned."[47] In his view, the use of the Hebrew text, never having been in church usage, was an outright apostasy. "We do not need the Hebrew Bible,

for it was never a part of the Church or in church usage. Therefore, to accept it means to fall away from that which has always been in the Church, that is, to move away from the fundamental basis of Orthodoxy." Feofan fully acknowledged the need for a Russian translation—he merely objected to the Hebrew model. He therefore considered the synodal translation deceitful and harmful. "The Church of God has known no other Word of God than that of the 70 commentators, and when Scripture is said to be divinely inspired, what is meant is Scripture precisely in this translation." He wrote quite harshly about this in *Reading Useful for the Soul* (in 1875-1876); he was answered no less harshly by Professor P.I. Gorskii-Platonov in *Orthodox Review*.[48]

Feofan did not confine himself to criticism. He offered to undertake publication of a popularly understandable commentary on the Bible based on the Slavonic text (especially the Wisdom books and the Prophets) so that others might become accustomed to this text, i.e., the Septuagint. "This will be done so that in spite of the existence of the Bible translated from the Hebrew, everyone, through this commentary, will know, understand, and read according to the Septuagint." His plan was not realized. Feofan himself only published a commentary on Psalm 119. He also had an idea of sitting down and translating the entire Bible from the Greek, "with commentaries justifying the Greek text and condemning the Hebrew." This intention, as well, remained unfulfilled. Only much later were several books of the Old Testament translated from the Greek by the Kazan professor Pavel A. Iungerov.[49] Feofan's anxiety already relates to the 1870s. Characteristically, the entire debate now went forward completely in the open, without any lay administrative secrecy; in the periodical press, and not as before in secret committees.

In the process of working on the Old Testament translation it was again and again discovered that the relationship between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint is too complex to permit the question of choosing between them in some general way. One could only inquire about a preferred or best reading of individual passages or verses and sometimes "choose" the Hebrew truth and sometimes the Greek reading. The best text from a philological point of view would be a collated one. In any case, a theological conclusion about the dogmatic worthiness of a specific text must be preceded by a detailed investigation of the individual books. Ivan S. Iakimov's dissertation on the Book of Jeremiah (1874) is an example of such work in those years.[50] The works of Daniil Khvol'son and Iakim A. Olesnitskii should also be recalled.[51]

Another difficulty appeared. It turned out that the "Slavonic Bible" could not, in its entirety, be equated with the Septuagint; the Slavonic text itself, in a certain sense and within certain limits, was a compound. Therein lay the principal importance of the Gorskii-Nevostruev description of biblical manuscripts in the Moscow Synodal Library.[52] Historical study of the Slavonic Bible began to be undertaken. It was no longer possible to speak in an overly simplified manner about "choosing" between the Slavonic and the Russian translation.

Interest was also enlivened on the question of biblical criticism. Most Russian researchers held "moderate" or "intermediate" views, but they quite noticeably expressed the influence of western critical literature. It is enough to mention the works of Filaret (Filaretov, 1824-1882), the rector of the Kiev Academy and later Bishop of Riga. In his dissertation on "The Origin of the Book of Job" ["Proiskhozhdenie Knigi Iova"] he not only accepted the later post-captivity dating of the book, but viewed the book more as a literary monument than as a book of the sacred canon. Moreover, all research was conducted according to the Hebrew text, with no attention given to the Slavonic reading. This proved incautious. Metropolitan Arsenii of Kiev found the very "tone of the dissertation" lacking any hint of the divinely inspired character of a book of the Bible, and the Holy Synod forbade its public defense. In the next year, 1873, *Works of the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy* printed the antique lectures of that same Metropolitan Arsenii on the "introduction to the sacred books of the Old Testament," delivered in the St. Petersburg Academy as long ago as 1823-1825. However, the brief preface "from the editor" admitted that the reader himself might judge "how far forward our biblical science has advanced from that time up to the present."

Iakim A. Olesnitskii (1842-1907) was another prominent representative of modern Russian biblicism. He was a scholar with a very broad horizon, at the same time an archeologist, a Hebraist, and a theologian. During his long years of teaching at the Kiev Academy he succeeded in creating there a tradition of biblical work. He was interested most by the history of biblical literature and poetry.[53] Olesnitskii visited Palestine many times to study existing monuments of biblical history, and the fruits of these archeological researches appeared as his extensive book *The Old Testament Temple in Jerusalem* [*Vetkhozavetnyi Khram v Ierusalime*, 1889]. Among the St. Petersburg biblicists mention must be made of Fr. Nikolai Vishniakov and Fedor Eleonskii.[54]

At that time Karl F. Keil's famous *Introduction* became the basic handbook among Russian biblicists.[55] Keil was translated into

Russian at the Kiev Academy.[56] Such representatives of orthodox Protestantism as Hengstenberg and Hefernik attracted many to their messianic or "Christological" commentaries on the Old Testament.[57] This amounted to its own form of a philosophy of biblical history: history as an evangelical preparation. "Russian theological literature affirmed many isagogical and exegetical views to such an extent that they nearly became part of tradition. They were usually concealed under the authority of the great fathers and teachers of the Church, but in fact represented an intermingling of Protestant orthodoxy with medieval Judaism."[58]

Very little study was made of the New Testament in those years. Apologetical interests predominated. A need and demand was felt to answer the "objections of the so-called negative critics"—Strauss and the Tübingen school, and Renan in particular.[59] One must mention here the name of Bishop Mikhail (Luzhin, 1830-1887), a former professor in the Moscow Academy, rector of the Kiev Academy, and Bishop of Kursk. He wrote a great deal. True, his books were usually only hasty, though also diligent, compilations and almost paraphrases or simply translations of a few foreign pamphlets, which were not always aptly selected and often not accurately understood. But this does not minimize their positive influence. What was important was that Bishop Mikhail replied to the "negations" instead of remaining silent. His themes always contained a good sense of the contemporary.[69] As an academic instructor he imparted to his students a love for scholarly reading and study and tried to attract them to scholarly work, training them to come to know critical problematics, albeit from someone else's textbooks. A sincere zealot of religious education, he was able to transfer this noble pathos to his students.

V

REFORMING THE ECCLESIASTICAL SCHOOLS

The question of reforming the ecclesiastical schools was openly discussed from the end of the 1850s, with the Ministry of Education providing the example. The public press critically posed the subject of education in connection with Nikolai Pirogov's famous book *Questions of Life* [*Voprosy zhizni*, 1856].[61] While the matter crept along

with methodical slowness in the synodal department, where it remained under the supervision of the over-procurator, people began to speak loudly about the darker sides of the ecclesiastical schools. In any case, social and general opinion expected and demanded reforms in the educational division.

In 1857 the Religio-Educational Administration began gathering reports and opinions from informed people and those with administrative experience. That same year the over-procurator's office dispatched a bureaucrat to France with the semi-official task of acquainting himself with the organization and life of French Roman Catholic seminaries. Information on theological schools was also gathered in England, and inquiry was made as to "how youths preparing for service in the Orthodox Church are educated in the East, and what they are taught." The tsar himself visited several seminaries during his trip through Russia in 1858. The following year an imperial directive ordered a special review of religious educational institutions. Prince S.N. Urusov, the director of the Religio-Educational Administration, was assigned the task of carrying out the review and determining the extent to which reform was necessary. He inspected eleven dioceses, concluding his survey only in 1861, and found the educational division, with its poverty, paucity of means, lax supervision, and absence of moral standards, particularly unsatisfactory. The curricula also proved highly impractical and unsuccessful. Basic reform was demanded. Even earlier, at the beginning of 1860, the Synod had formed a special committee under the chairmanship of Dimitrii Muretov, then Bishop of Kherson, for the purpose of examining reports and materials sent in from the provinces. Urusov's report was transferred to this committee, which was to take all of the reports into consideration and work out a reform proposal.

Archbishop Dimitrii quickly surprised and confounded many with the decisiveness of his proposals. His plan combined two motives. On the one hand, he felt that the existing school network should be preserved, but in order to reconstruct the schools, turning them into general educational gymnasiums under the religious department and making them comparable, in terms of program and rights, to ordinary gymnasiums. The clergy would retain their former privilege of educating their children, but access to other social strata would not be closed off or even made difficult for students of the class school. Many students, and even ecclesiastical authorities, wanted this freedom of "departure from the clerical calling" for a variety of reasons. Filaret of Moscow opposed any restraints or restrictions. "A slave is not pious. Why should free men be enslaved while those without freedom are

granted it?" On the other hand, Archbishop Dimitrii thought it necessary to completely reconstruct the theological classes of the existing seminaries into special pastoral schools. He favored retaining the designation "seminary," although it was above all the Roman Catholic seminary that he had in mind. It logically followed that students who were already being trained and were set in their vocation should be admitted into these seminaries, but only those who wished to enter them of their own free will should be transferred from the ecclesiastical gymnasiums. The new seminaries must be closed educational institutions with a very strict ascetical and liturgical regimen.

Archbishop Dimitrii was disturbed above all by the clergy's inner lack of preparedness and resolve in fulfilling all the complex tasks of pastoral service. Their spirit had to be raised and their ardor strengthened. Those of other social classes who so desired had to be admitted to the seminaries. Strictly speaking, Dimitrii's plan signified the tacit destruction of the class character of the clergy. The implementation of this plan would have quickly undermined the entire existing ecclesiastical-political system and liberated the Church from the paternalism and authority of the state.

How much of this the archbishop had foreseen or consciously realized is difficult to say. But his opponents immediately detected the plan's link with decisive alterations throughout the life of the Church. Such a complete break with the historically formed and customary type of mixed school seemed dangerous. Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow, represented in the committee by Aleksandr Gorskii, was of this opinion. The chief weakness of the new proposal, of course, lay in its difficult financing. The state was ill disposed to new expenditures and assignations, and no firm conviction existed that local means might be increased. Moreover, the very fact of a shift of the church schools onto local support would signify the weakening of the Educational Administration's central authority, i.e., the authority of the over-procurator, over the entire system of supervision of the synodal bureaucracy. The majority of the committee, nevertheless, approved and accepted Archbishop Dimitrii's project in its essentials. The lay members remained of a different opinion. In particular, Tertii Filippov, the committee's secretary,[62] cautioned against the ascetical one-sidedness that troubled him in the proposal for the "seminaries." He preferred a return to the broad and humanistic principles of the old 1814 statute.

The committee somewhat altered its chairman's project. It was decided that a single school would be preserved, but at the same time theological subjects would be separated and concentrated in a single

higher series. This was in keeping with the spirit of the old school system. The general twelve-year course was so constructed that the first eight classes corresponded to the plan for the general schools, while theological subjects were placed primarily in a higher level comprising the last four years. A desire was expressed from the provinces that classical languages not be required but remain in the program only for those interested in continuing their education in the higher schools. Were they really necessary for the rural clergy? The committee, however, would not allow the possibility of lowering the general educational level of the ecclesiastical schools. Greek, the language of the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Fathers and closely bound up with Slavonic, must remain inviolable in the seminary course. Latin, as a classical language, also had to be retained. The committee even proposed making Hebrew compulsory. Philosophy was fully restored, and only mathematics was abridged. The work of the committee was sent for review and comment to the diocesan hierarchs, the academy conferences, and individual laymen. Enormously tardy, these new reports arrived only in 1864 and 1865, by which time the school reform was already being discussed in the periodical press. Rostislavov's notorious book *On the State of the Ecclesiastical Schools in Russia,* printed in Leipzig, appeared in 1862, provoking a great stir and not being allowed free circulation in Russia.

Only in 1865, with the appointment of Count Dmitrii A. Tolstoi as over-procurator, did the question of school reform move ahead. Characteristically, state initiative proved to be the decisive influence, for the reform was sponsored more by the government than by the Church: it was a state reform of its own schools of the "religious department." The new over-procurator secured beforehand a significant increase in government expenditures, and successfully sought out new sources of local support. In 1866, under the nominal chairmanship of Metropolitan Arsenii of Kiev, a new committee was established to elaborate statutes for the religious schools. Nektarii, a former rector of the St. Petersburg Academy and at that time the Bishop of Nizhnii Novgorod and a member of the Synod, normally presided.[63] Lay members (representatives of other departments) were once again included in the composition of the committee.

With scarcely any debate, the committee decided to leave the general scheme of the old 1814 statute unaltered. The ecclesiastical schools continued to function as preparatory classes, and the seminaries were to operate as before as schools of general education and theology. Archbishop Dimitrii's plan went unrealized. Only the "two archimandrites," Filaret Filaretov, rector of the Kiev Academy, and Mikhail

Luzin, inspector at the Moscow Academy, submitted a special statement.[64] By dividing the school into educational and pastoral parts, the archimandrites hoped to skirt the severe limits on the number of treasury-supported students or students with stipends in any one school, which would greatly hamper the ability of the clergy to educate their children.

The "two archimandrites" presented their alternate plan during the drafting of the final statute. They repeated all of the basic propositions of Archbishop Dimitrii, and proposed a gymnasium of seven grades based on a classical curriculum and a three-year pastoral seminary open to all social classes. The committee rejected their proposal, which seemed to dangerously isolate the theology classes. Would such an isolated school of theology attract students? Any sense of the Church [*tserkovnost'*] would be weakened if the gymnasiums were to serve as too broad an avenue to secular status. However, owing to the archimandrites' protest, the general committee's draft of the statute cautiously introduced a differentiation of theological and general subjects, and upon finishing the general grades those who wished to do so were given the possibility of leaving. By 1863 seminarians had access to the universities (this access was eliminated in 1879 for general political considerations).

One should note that when discussing the committee's proposals Makarii Bulgakov, then Archbishop of Khar'kov, firmly objected to dividing the schools into two types. He even suggested placing the projected ecclesiastical gymnasiums under general supervision, in order to gain government financial support, although their teachers were to be recruited from the ecclesiastical academies and the diocesan bishops were to remain honorable observers. Only the lower religious schools would be supported at church expense. In order to eliminate hostility and prejudice, the ecclesiastical gymnasiums might approximate the secular ones, and secular administrators might be appointed, provided, of course, they had an academy education. Moreover, Makarii thought that the authority of the educational councils had to be extended at the expense of the local school heads.

In May, 1867 the Synod accepted new statutes based on the draft of the majority, which were affirmed by imperial authority. The 1814 structure was generally retained. Characteristic, however, was a decision to admit outsiders to the higher theology class if they had finished middle school and passed examinations on the theological subjects taught in the previous seminary class. Moreover, auditors of mature age and with significant familiarity with ecclesiastical literature could also be admitted to this theology class upon personal

examination by the diocesan hierarch. Both decisions had been proposed by the over-procurator–a subtle hint aimed at the independence of the theology school.

Among the general rearrangements of school affairs the wide application of the elective and consultative principle proved particularly important. The office of seminary rector became elective. The seminary administration selected candidates from a list prepared by a general educational assembly, and those selected were presented to the Synod by the diocesan hierarch, who could also recommend his own candidate. The Synod was then free to confirm any of them, or to choose or appoint one of its own. In the majority of the seminaries members of the white clergy, or even laymen who were willing to be ordained priests, were elected rectors. Inspectors were also elected, and the faculties gained wide participation in seminary administration. This was an especially sensitive departure from the previous system.

The fact that the clergy, through deputies in the seminary administration, were now drawn into active participation in the life of the ecclesiastical schools proved quite important. The elementary ecclesiastical schools were generally entrusted to the care of the local clergy, a development above all closely related to the fact that the clergy were engaged in obtaining local financial support for them. It was natural to grant the local clergy supervisory authority. Beginning in 1867 "diocesan congresses," or assemblies of the clergy, were organized precisely to facilitate efforts to support themselves financially. These innovations were not always fully and freely applied in practice; many were openly or quietly amended. Moreover, the entire school regimen underwent serious alteration as early as 1884, so that the statutes of the "sixties" were in effect no more than fifteen years. In any case, the reform did signify a step closer to life.

After the confirmation of the new statute the Religio-Educational Administration was eliminated, at the over-procurator's suggestion, and an Educational Committee of the Holy Synod took its place. Father Isof Vasil'ev, the well-known archpriest of Russia's embassy in Paris, was named chairman.[65] The Educational Committee was subordinate to the Synod, and it is characteristic that one had to write to the committee in care of the over-procurator. In essence, the ecclesiastical schools remained, as before, chiefly the concern of the over-procurator. Their dependence even increased, for in spite of the academies' new right to examine (by "examining lessons") and recommend candidates for school offices, their links with the seminaries weakened. In practice an exceptional confusion and a mass of petty red tape were created. State influence over the ecclesiastical

schools became particularly obvious with the development of the institution of member-inspectors in the educational committee. Although the inspectors possessed academy educations and were of clerical backgrounds, they were always lay bureaucrats representing the over-procurator, similar to the secretaries of the ecclesiastical consistories.

Only after the confirmation of the general ecclesiastical school statutes was the question of reforming the ecclesiastical academies advanced. The conclusions of the academic conferences were requested and obtained in 1867, and a commission was immediately formed with Nektarii as chairman. In 1868 it already presented its draft of a new statute, which was quickly published "for general discussion." The Synod requested assessments of the proposal from the bishops of the cities where the academies were located, as well as from bishops Makarii (Bulgakov) of Lithuania, Evsevii of Mogilev, and Leontii of Podol'sk.[66] In 1869, after further scrutiny by an expanded commission, the draft was presented to the Synod, and on May 30 of that year received imperial confirmation. It was decided that the academies in St. Petersburg and Kiev should be reformed in the fall, and those of Moscow and Kazan in the following year.

The new statute charged the ecclesiastical academies with a double task: they were not only to be higher theological schools, but also some kind of pedagogical institutes of the religious department. The academies prepared students more for pedagogy than for pastoral work, and hence the eclecticism and inescapably large number of subjects. Some subjects were taught at the time only for the purpose of preparing teachers for schools granting advanced degrees. By dividing the school into "faculties" or departments the new statute sought to mitigate the excessively large number of subjects in the curriculum, so that only certain subjects remained required for all, while the majority were distributed by groups. In the end three such "departments"–theology, church history, and applied church teaching–were created, each headed by a special assistant to the rector. Although the new statute sought to ease the burden of basic study in elective subjects by distributing them into groups, it nonetheless shattered the unity of theological education.

The requirement that one possess an academic degree was a characteristic innovation. During the third year students wrote a final paper and took a general examination, and only the best remained for the fourth year. Those with an average grade below four and one-half were given the title "active student" and immediately released.[67] Fourth-year students studied only a few special subjects and prepared

for their master's degree examinations, while also working on a dissertation. Moreover, they were required to attend lectures on pedagogics, with practical exercises. At the end of the fourth year they took the master's examinations, but in order to receive the degree they also had to present a printed dissertation and publicly defend it. This was a decisive and essential step toward advertising and making public the academy's instruction and theological work in general. Publicity was intended to counter the widely held prejudice about the backwardness of the academy's scholarship and to make it possible to put it on the same level with the university. It also seemed to be the best method for struggling against false opinions and the readiest means for inculcating healthy ones. At the St. Petersburg Academy at the end of the 1850s the idea even arose of making academy instruction open to the general public (as at the university), or organizing public lectures on theological subjects. Metropolitan Grigorii introduced a proposal along this line in the Synod, but without result. Ten years later it was revived in Archbishop Nektarii's commission. However, the sermon seemed more appropriate to counter disbelief than the scholarly lecture. The new statute stipulated that an ordinary professor possess a doctoral degree; the rector also had to have one. Those professors who lacked them had three years either to acquire one or else leave the academy. The degree required a public defense of a printed dissertation. A significant change in the faculty's circumstances was produced by a new limit on the length of professorial service. After twenty-five years a new election was recommended. A professor could be reelected for another five years, but the total term of service could not exceed thirty-five years. The purpose of this was to revitalize the faculty.

To prepare teachers, the institution of privatdocent was established in the academies. Those with master's degrees, and even candidates, could read private lectures. They could do so, however, only after presenting a dissertation *pro venia legendi* (as was done at that time in the universities). Originally a separate philosophy department was proposed, so that the academies might legally confer advanced degrees in philosophy—a proposal all the more appropriate since at the time the chairs of philosophy at the universities were occupied by masters or candidates from the academies. However, in order not to violate the uniformity of the theological schools, the plan was rejected and philosophical subjects were added to those of the general curriculum. Instead of a philosophy department, a department of practical theology was formed, with a quite variegated and disjointed program. It was more of a literary-pedagogical department than a pastoral one—a very characteristic trait for that time. The majority

of students in this department hardly enrolled "in hopes of the priesthood," but rather for the sake of a teaching career. For the people of that time the "power to teach" (or, more accurately, "enlighten") merely supplanted the priesthood's true gift in pastoral service, the "service of the sacraments."

The St. Petersburg Academy made the first proposal to create a special physics-mathematics department, again with pedagogical purposes: to prepare mathematics and physics teachers for schools of the religious department. This idea was also rejected at the final re-examination of the statute–at the special insistence of the over-procurator, who refused to seek the necessary financial credits. It is true that it was not worth it to create a special (and abbreviated) "faculty" for the sake of a simple pedagogical need, yet, strangely enough, no one understood the vital need of the study of the exact and natural sciences in the theological schools. This was precisely the moment when a real campaign began in the name of those sciences against the Christian worldview and against religion in general, and serious attention to them would have been particularly timely. Moreover, establishing a chair of "natural-scientific apologetics" at the Moscow Academy, even with financial support from the Moscow Diocese, proved difficult to agree on.

Apparently it was feared that academy apologetics were too old-fashioned. But even if there were grounds for such a fear, does it follow that the task should be removed from consideration? The Church cannot escape its apologetical duty, and it was particularly unavoidable in those years. And to undertake apologetics without a fundamental knowledge of the appropriate sciences or command of their methods, while relying and becoming dependent upon popular literature, was the most dangerous course of all. Such second or third-hand apologetics could never be convincing. To a certain degree apologetical material was included as part of the philosophical disciplines–metaphysics and psychology. But nevertheless a glaring omission remained.

The hasty decision to close the missionary department at the Kazan Academy–as unfit for the normal pattern of higher theological schools–was quite characteristic. As a consequence the entire Orthodox mission in the east was undermined. Only with great difficulty were the academy's missionary subjects successfully preserved, and even then only as non-required courses, beyond the normal curriculum. The reformers lacked a living sense of the needs and requirements of the Church. Introducing new statutes could not "infuse" the ecclesiastical schools with a "sense of the Church" or establish organic ties with

the ecclesiastical environment. Most people at that time were concerned with "drawing near" to the world, and the reform was elaborated in that same spirit of vague humanism that adorned the other "Great Reforms."

A general evaluation of the reform is far from easy. The new statute was in effect too short a time to judge it by its fruits. However, one must remember that old men who had studied according to the old statute conceived and gave birth to the new one, which provides living testimony not only to the weakness of the new statute, but to the inadequacies of the old one. Many had to teach what they themselves had never been taught. Of course, the chief distinction of the 1869 academy statute lay in the fact that it clearly specified and preserved the scholarly character of the higher theological schools. Archbishop Nektarii's commission used the university statute as its guide in reorganizing the academies, and from here stems the spirit of academic freedom, the calculation on the creative independence of the academies.

Yet even the best statute could not surmount the spiritual inertia of the age. It was an era of practical "enthusiasms" in Russia, and a wave of oversimplification had already arisen. The ideal of that era was destruction, not construction; "enlightenment," not creativity. There was a considerable love of learning or curiosity, but the will to creativity was not acquired. Everyone hastened to learn or communicate ready-made answers or resolutions.These abstract answers inspired a certain faith, while research produced fear. Too many studied not the subject itself, but rather the western literature about it. It seemed that the only task facing modern Russian scholarship was to "catch up" with western learning. One gets the impression that Russians theologized more through a westernized or western inertia than from inner need or conviction. Through all the long years of western influence in the schools the Russians never acquired the habit of asking themselves about the spiritual prerequisites of theology. They nearly forgot that construction requires a theology that lives in the Church, not theology in general. It was a question of spiritual method. One must learn to theologize not merely from scholarly tradition or inertia or simply from love of knowledge, but from the living experience of the Church and from the religious need for knowledge. Otherwise theological education can never recover spiritual balance and conviction. Filaret of Moscow had already provided an example of such a theological method in the preceding era. Few, however, were either willing or able to follow him.

VI

HISTORY AND ECCLESIASTICAL SELF-AWARENESS

According to the 1814 statute Holy Scripture was to become the chief subject in the academies, with philosophy holding second place. The biblical or exegetical method was approved for use in dogmatics, for everything had to be demonstrated, and demonstrated through the use of texts. Training in historical scholarship was strengthened in the 1830s, and under Count Protasov history came to be viewed as the best antidote for biblical excesses. At that time history was seen as a testimony of tradition. Therefore, patrology, the "historico-theological study of the church fathers," was introduced as a special subject in the seminary program. This was a direct expression of the influence of the western example, for at the time church history was just dawning in Germany. Russia immediately reflected it. Russians read August Neander with particular relish, and sometimes they openly set themselves the goal of combining western "genius" and learning with eastern "authority" and the "spirit of life."[68] Under the influence of German idealism philosophical interest was united with history.

Most importantly, a vital and immediate historical sensitivity awakened, a need appeared for historical vision, a "desire to witness events," a wish "to know as a witness knows," which Vasilii V. Bolotov saw as the very essence of historicism.[69] The best and most vigorous people in Russia embarked on historical research from an inner inclination, from a spiritual need. The power of their personal influence and example largely explains why church history predominantly characterized the Russian theological educational system, in any case from the middle of the nineteenth century. This is not the place to describe in detail all that Russian scholars did in various branches of church history. A vast amount was done in collecting and criticizing sources and in providing a historical synthesis. But the historian of theology is interested in only one aspect of this scholarly work: how is the concentration on history expressed in the general theological world-view? How is it reflected in theological synthesis? To this end it is sufficient merely to note a few critical turning points in this scholarly process.

The historical trend in Russian theology began at the Moscow Academy, where the first school of Russian church historians was

created. Filaret Gumilevskii (1805-1866) first introduced the "historical method" into the teaching of dogmatics. He aroused in his students not only an interest but a love for history. Filaret was a scholar who loved to work from sources, and was devoted to archival research. He enjoyed collecting and weighing facts. Thus, his books on the church fathers, Russian religious writers, and Greek hymnographers arose—almost in the form of dictionaries. In his capacity as bishop in Khar'kov and Chernigov, Filaret engaged in "historical-statistical descriptions," but he was not a compiler in the old style, as was Metropolitan Evgenii (Bolkhovitinov).[70] Precisely a historian, not an antiquarian, he felt the need to draw conclusions. Moreover, he had a gift for historical narration and synthesis. For its time, his *History of the Russian Church* [*Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*] was an event. It went through five printings between 1847 and 1849. All of Russian church history, from the baptism of Rus' until 1826, was told and displayed as a vital whole for the first time, and told clearly and profoundly. Profundity generally distinguishes Filaret as a historian. Sometimes it got in his way. He found it difficult to write impartially; he pondered events aloud, finding it hard to conceal his likes and dislikes. His bold and acute judgments about the past, as well as his comments on recent history, derive from an almost obsessive sense of justice. The history of the synodal period, as he recounted it, was too transparent. His earlier essays on the Stoglav Council and the Old Ritual set people talking.[71]

In 1846, when Makarii (Bulgakov) began printing chapters of his book on Russian Christianity prior to Vladimir in *Christian Reading*, Filaret hurriedly published his *History*. Filaret feared he was being duplicated. Makarii, however, wrote at a completely different tempo and on a wholly different scale. Conceiving a multivolume work, he wrote each volume separately (the first edition appearing between 1857 and 1883). Makarii's death halted his *History* at volume twelve, describing the events of the Council of 1666.[72] Filaret hastily provided a general sketch showing the unity and interconnections among events. He tried to give an understanding of the historical process from within. His account is no longer satisfactory. He wrote too much about church administration and too little about the inner life of the Church or society. His presentation is overly rational and at times monotonously repetitive. Yet his account always has perspective, and one can always feel in it a breath of life.

Makarii has no historical perspective at all. He confines himself to a narrative pragmatism and does not transcend a mechanical chronology. Criticism of sources is nearly absent. As a historian Makarii remains a mere compiler of facts and texts. His history is nothing more than

a "historical mosaic."[73] Factual thoroughness is the sole merit of the multivolume work. It is a monument of an unusual love of labor and an exceptional desire for knowledge. To a certain degree factual thoroughness marks a genuine and important step forward in scholarship. But this does not redeem methodological weakness. Giliarov-Platonov termed Makarii's method "mechanical," but, to be more accurate, Makarii never had a method. His *History* was written without method or guiding ideas–it was a history written by someone who was not a historian. Makarii learned the art of historical narrative in the process of writing, and thus the later volumes are more lively than the first ones. But he did not acquire a method.

In his first years of teaching at the Moscow Academy Filaret Gumilevskii met a student who soon became a friend. This was Aleksandr V. Gorskii (1812-1875). For many long years they were joined by a tender bond of friendship and a common passion for history–precisely a passion, which seized their entire beings. "When these friends of scholarship began to work together, the study of history became their essential nourishment," writes the historian of the Moscow Academy.[74] They continued to work together even when they could not live and serve together. Gorskii's assistance–as a librarian and critic–can be detected in nearly all of Filaret's writings.

Gorskii is one of the most luminous figures in the history of Russian scholarship. And yet he betrays a certain tragic fragility. There is more refinement in his image than strength. From a distance Gorskii even seems frightened. S.M. Solov'ev directly accuses Metropolitan Filaret of stifling Gorskii's great talent through his despotism, an estimation often repeated without examination. The charge is utterly false. It is true that Gorskii's character and thoughts were sometimes inwardly constrained and indecisive, but not from some kind of fear of outside judgment or opinion, even that of the metropolitan. He had a certain spiritual fastidiousness. Filaret did not in any way "dry up" Gorskii. An inner fear held him back at every step, as can immediately be seen from the diaries he wrote as a youth. "Unfortunately," wrote his contemporary Petr S. Kazanskii, "the broader his knowledge became, the more his lack of self-confidence increased. It kept him from publishing, and through him, others."[75] He did not suffer from the helplessness of an erudite who knows too much and is unable to master his knowledge. Gorskii had a gift for historical apprehension; he fully commanded his knowledge.[76] His was a deep spiritual fracture, one of an intellectual sort, and Gorskii himself knew it. "Poor and lacking the power of an independent intellect, I follow behind someone else at every step and fear that through

gullibility I may be carried away by either good or harmful guides," he wrote about himself in a letter to a friend. He always sought to attach himself to someone, the consequence, as he considered it, of a sheltered and stern education in his parents' home "under the threatening rod of humility." "My youth passed in a quiet, humble, and dead manner." Gorskii complained that while a youth "God and his holy religion were not revealed in my heart." He found the arid heart imparted to him a burden. "The hand of parental protection–always a dangerous one–caressed me, and in that moment forged heavy fetters cutting deeply into my soul." This was an inner inhibition, not an outer fear.

Gorskii entered the academy almost as a child, at the age of sixteen. He came from the philosophy class at the Kostroma Seminary two years younger than normal. The academy inspector[77] saw something rare in his development, yet at first Gorskii found it hard to study at the academy. In the seminary he had received no theological training at all, and now had to learn for the first time what others were going over for the second. His father entrusted him to the care of Fr. Fedor Golubinskii, another native of Kostroma. Gorskii never had any affinity for philosophy, and remained unreceptive to Golubinskii's encouragement in that direction. The latter's "warm piety," however, deeply affected him and accounts for his constant pondering of religion. He always remained friends, in "learned brotherhood," with Golubinskii and with Fr. Petr Delitsyn.[78] These men supplied his interest in the "mystical" dimension of Christianity. He read Fénelon, Hamann, and others, and his religious make-up contains many traits of the Alexandrian age: alertness to dreams and portents, belief in the mysterious communion of souls, etc.[79]

An overlay of traditionalism, derived from the influence of Filaret Gumilevskii, proved stronger than the western mystical influence. Apparently it was Filaret who first explained to Gorskii his vocation as a historian. They became close friends first as scholars. In later years they could recall long conversations about history and the hours they spent together over manuscripts and works printed before the seventeenth-century correction of the liturgical books. But their friendship went deeper. Filaret led Gorskii into the world of patristic wisdom and *askesis,* and taught him ascetical wisdom and works on it. "The work of salvation begins in us as in winter, with a contrite heart, a firm submergence of the self, and constraint of will, thought, and feelings." He warned against any enthusiasm for abstractions, the "almost gnostic" spirit that can infect the reader of German books: "Firmly thrust the claws of the German wolf from

you." Filaret taught Gorskii the spirit of practical churchliness and canonical obedience.[80] He advised him to subordinate the findings of scholarship to faith, and cautioned him against a passion for books themselves–a danger like any other passion. "Taste and see–this is the way to knowledge of the Christian religion."[81] Gorskii firmly remembered the lesson. He later took clerical orders to strengthen his theological work, and for the joy of offering the bloodless sacrifice. And after many humiliations Gorskii achieved spiritual peace. Parental injunction prevented him from following Filaret along the monastic path. He submitted, bitterly, and instead embarked on a life of scholarly seclusion. Later he did not wish to part from the academy to which he had given all his love.

Gorskii had a striking impressionability, receptivity, and, above all, an unquenchable capacity for knowledge. He read a great deal, and loved reading more than writing, but his thought is neither passive nor languid. He preferred to work from primary sources so that he might build from them himself. He did not merely gather materials–he immediately set about building from them, even if only for himself. His was the scholar's love of knowledge, not the curiosity of a dilettante.

While occupying the chair of church history at the academy, Gorskii had to lecture singlehandedly on too many topics, ranging from biblical history to the present, although biblical history was soon given over to a special instructor and treated separately. But for many years he had to give complete courses of lectures on both general church history and the history of the Russian Church. He spent great amounts of time preparing them. In general church history he largely relied on August Neander and Johann Gieseler.[82] But he personally reworked everything from original sources. He valued Johann Mosheim highly,[83] and became enamored with Neander's desire and knack for discovering religious meaning in the way events transpired and with his talent for depicting the historical process "as a single whole, in the harmoniousness and interrelationship of all its parts." The foremost aim of his lectures was to demonstrate this "inner interrelationship of facts." Dissatisfied with formal pragmatism, he spoke of organic development. Most of all he dwelled on the history of dogma, and subsequently used the historical method when lecturing on dogmatics. Among the western books on dogmatics, he usually employed the textbooks of Franz Staudenmayer and J.E. Kuhn, as well as those of K.F. August Kahnis and Freidrich Filippi.[84] Only a portion of his lectures (on gospel and apostolic history) have been published. They actually constitute a philosophy of New Testa-

ment history, told with rare depth and perception, and illustrating how throughout history Christ awakened faith in his disciples and in the people. One must also note the exemplary attempts at patristic biography in his scholarly lives of Athanasius, Basil, Epiphanius, and Theodoret. His audience always remembered his unforgettable characterization of Origen.

However, Gorskii chose Russian church history as his main subject. In this connection one must particularly note his efforts, together with those of Kapiton I. Nevostruev, at describing the Slavic manuscripts in the Moscow Synodal Library. The six-volume *Description* [*Opisanie*] of the library represents the fruit of many years of intense work. Not only does it describe the manuscripts in the strict sense of the word, it also provides a basic evaluation or characterization of the documents and their significance as historical sources. The impetus for this work on the Synod's book repository came from Metropolitan Filaret. He wanted to put all the manuscripts into scholarly order, along with the necessary research, and for this reason entrusted the job to "his own." He did not like the interference of outsiders such as Mikhail Pogodin or Vukol Undol'skii.[85] Gorskii accomplished the task in exemplary fashion, and the work remains of value. This is particularly true for the description of the biblical manuscripts, and precisely because Gorskii supplied a work of scholarship rather than a formal description. To this day the description retains its importance as an attempt to write the history of the Slavic text of the Bible.

The *Description* provoked attack, and the censorship was hard pressed to allow it. Ioann Sokolov, then still an archimandrite, examined the book and saw it as a reproach to the Russian Church, which prior to Genadii's day "did not possess the Word of God in pure, complete form, but received and read it in an imperfect version."[86] Ioann found it confusing that no single copy agreed "exactly" with the Septuagint. He was perplexed by the details of the Genadii codex, the version of Veniamin the Dominican.[87] Would it not be better to omit all commentaries and critical scholarly apparatus? With Filaret's approval Gorskii composed an "apology" directed at the censor's report, defending the freedom of historical criticism of documents in its own realm. On these questions he would not waver.

Gorskii was less an archeographer than a historian in the direct sense. He treated documents and sources with a scholar's eye, and he had thought through his own historical worldview and philosophy of Russian history. In his own day Nikolai Polevoi made a powerful impression on him, a fact tied to his unflagging interest in the spiritual

life of the Orthodox people.[88] How was Christian teaching accepted in custom and life? Hence, he was interested less in official documents than in literary sources, especially sermons and the lives of the saints, which open access to this inner world. Giliarov-Platonov's definition of the Russian church historian's duty "to portray the life of the Russian people as a society of believers" applies to Gorskii's lectures. Yet to this day the history of the Russian Church has not been written in this manner.

During these same years the historians of the Kazan school still more vigorously expressed such a view of Russian church history. One need only mention A.P. Shchapov (1830-1876).[89] The attention given to the social side of church life is already powerfully disclosed in his famous dissertation on the Russian schism. For all its deficiencies and hyperbole, the book retains its value precisely for this reason. Unbridled and impassioned, Shchapov wrote with inspired improvisation. And yet, in spite of his great love and capacity for work–to the point of self-neglect–he could not work methodically. In his inaugural lecture at the academy on Orthodoxy and Russian nationality he outlined a plan for the history of popular faith that he did not fulfill. At much too early a date he was lost to scholarship. Petr Znamenskii,[90] in his history of the Kazan Academy, aptly writes:

> Shchapov shot through the academy like a low-flying meteor, blazing past and illuminating his subjects with a fantastic and, if you will, false light. Nevertheless, it was a bright light, and for attentive people he could shine a beam down a previously invisible road.

Shchapov's early writings are symptomatic of the awakened desire to write the history of the Church as the history of something whole. This is partly an expression of currents coming from the Moscow Academy. It is also partly explained by the influence of the Slavophiles.

Gorskii was not only a scholar and a master craftsman, he was also a teacher–an incomparable one. He taught by word and by living example, in the classroom and in the library.[91] He could awaken enthusiasm for scholarship among his students, arouse a sense of history in them, and divert them to historical research, always on the basis of sources. He carefully kept track of his own students, and those of others as well. He helped them by advice or by scholarly caution.

Gorskii loved working for others. "A legend goes the rounds of the Moscow Ecclesiastical Academy that the amazing sparkle of canonical and historical reasoning in Filaret's remarkable resolutions owes

a great debt to Gorskii." He expended considerable effort on the Russian New Testament, and assisted Sergii's work on *The Complete Menologion of the East* [*Polnyi mesiatseslov vostoka*].[92] How Gorskii helped Filaret Gumilevskii has already been discussed. His influence can also be detected in many others. For example, he led Evgenii E. Golubinskii to embark on the idea of reconstructing the organization and life of the ancient Russian Church on the basis of Byzantine material.[93] Gorskii himself provided models of such comparative analysis in his lectures. Nikolai Kapterev's method for his work on the history of the time of Patriarch Nikon was suggested through Gorskii, and Kapterev made use of material Gorskii had already prepared.[94] Gorskii succeeded in creating a scholarly movement at the academy. His personal example was a testimony and a reminder that scholarship is an exploit [*podvig*] and a service.

A school of historians was created at the Moscow Academy. Above all Evgenii E. Golubinskii (1834-1912) must be mentioned. He disliked admitting how much his work owed to Gorskii. A man of a different spirit, he was a member of the generation that produced the leaders of nihilism. There is something of that nonhistorical bent for exposé in his personality, in his historical method, in the very psychology of his historical work, and particularly in his paranoiac distrust of sources, which bordered on suspicion. He is surprised every time he becomes convinced his sources or documents are reliable and accurate. Everywhere he expects to find fakes, forgeries, errors, fantastic tales, superstitious rumors, beliefs, and legends. He always poses the possibility of deliberate deception. This very prominent trait in him derives from the ideas of "enlightened" journalism.

Golubinskii transformed ordinary mistrust and suspicion into a historical method. He wished to counterbalance the "false history," which deceives others but does not deceive itself, with a "genuine history," true and sober. He proposed writing a history of the Russian Church with this "critical" method, which, above all, meant criticism of sources. Yet Golubinskii never separated such criticism from criticism of life, events, or the order of things. For him "criticism" meant exposé. The first volume of his *History* is solely occupied with debunking several untrustworthy historical traditions and accepted opinions about the earliest periods of Russian Christianity. However, this criticism represents only one side of his work. With exceptional accuracy he gathered and arranged in categories all surviving information and facts in order to produce a picture of the inner life and structure of the ancient Russian Church, although it is a mosaic with gaps.

Golubinskii did not like to make any philosophical deductions from history; he searched for no laws of development; he had no sociological analysis. He was a historian-publicist. Throughout his writings one can detect the "militant moralizing of reason," as the academician Vasilii Vasil'evskii characterized Golubinskii's historical manner.[95] He had his own practical ecclesiastical ideal, one quite typical for the time, which peculiarly combined the most acute westernism with the spirit of a traditional provincialism. He joins an acceptance of the Petrine reform in its extreme form with a veneration of pre-Byzantine church antiquity. More than anything he awaited a reform in the customary life of the Russian Church. The cultural level of the clergy must be raised and their pedagogical activity strengthened. Priests must be returned from the plow to the book, which presupposes a change in social conditions. This personal ideal can always be felt in Golubinskii's historical interpretations and characterizations, for he thought the historian had been granted the right to judge, punish, and praise. Above all, he wanted to see in history living people.

> Inasmuch as in history, as in the actual life produced by it, each person is significant only as a living, moral personality, and, inasmuch as our moral sensitivity wishes to know itself and seeks to find itself in a living community with historical people, we should either grant them honor or pronounce upon them a stern, so-called historical judgment.

Golubinskii succeeded in publishing only the first volume of his *History* (in two parts), dealing with the pre-Mongol era. He was able to do so only with the vigorous support of Makarii, by that time already Metropolitan of Moscow. Makarii helped him finance the publication, and when rumors arose about Golubinskii's harmful intentions, Makarii brought in his hierarchical authority. When Makarii died, leaving him without powerful patrons, his critical method proved dangerous. Soon he had to leave his teaching position at the academy. Only in old age could he publish the first half of his second volume, which he had prepared for publication many years earlier. Soon afterwards he lost his sight. The other half of the second volume, in rough draft, was put out only after his death.

Golubinskii did not master historical synthesis. His strength lay in details, in scrutinizing and compiling facts. And yet his zest for publicistics had some impact on Russian historiography. He left

behind the reminder that history is created life. His teaching at the Moscow Academy, together with that of Vasilii Kliuchevskii, aroused attention to the development of Russian church history.[96]

Work in the field of ancient church history also moved forward, not without a little tension. Here we must mention Petr S. Kazanskii (1819-1878), who wrote on the history of classical and Russian monasticism. He still belonged to the older generation and the "old manner" of history. A.P. Lebedev (1845-1908), who occupied a chair at the academy for many years and then left to replace Ivantsov-Platonov at Moscow University, enjoyed great influence. Lebedev attracted students. Many valuable monographs on history and patrology were written and published on themes he suggested. Here one need only mention Aleksandr P. Dobroklonskii and Nikolai N. Glubokovskii.[97] Yet Lebedev was not an independent thinker. He followed the western literature on his subjects more than he studied the subjects themselves. Being of the opinion that before anything else the Russians must "catch up" to western scholarship, he tried to impart to his audience a favorable acquaintance with it. His service in doing so is incontestable.

Lebedev loved to write. He wrote with an easy, lively style, with a journalist's pungency and passion, and with the inevitable, concomitant oversimplification—a trait that is noticeable in his history of dogmatic movements. Lebedev was not at all a theologian—he relates theological debates as a sideline observer, without inwardly participating in them. Yet although he does not participate, he is not impartial. His best work, his famous dissertation on the first ecumenical councils, lacks precisely this sympathetic penetration into the meaning of the events he describes and interprets. Fr. Ivantsov-Platonov demonstrated this fact well at the time, in his detailed review of the book.[98] In his later works Lebedev remained only a popularizer, often a very careless one. However, his readability and journalistic style impelled many toward a serious interest in the study of history, and his name must be remembered with respect in the history of Russian scholarship. Filipp A. Ternovskii (1838-1884), a professor at the Kiev Academy and the university, also belonged to this same journalistic current in church historiography.[99] He largely worked from textbooks. The journalistic manner is quite characteristic of the historiography of that era.

Ivan E. Troitskii (1842-1901) and Vasilii V. Bolotov (1853-1900), who created the St. Petersburg Academy's school of church history, are men of quite another style. Troitskii largely devoted his efforts to Byzantine history. He was a thoughtful and careful scholar

from whom one could learn methodology and historical interpretation. A historian of very broad theological and practical horizons, he could see living people in the past and demonstrate the psychology of events. In his most significant book, devoted to the problem of Church-state relations in Byzantium, Troitskii saw the hostility between the "black" and "white" clergy, the quarrel between the *oikonomistai* and the *akrivistai*, as the decisive factor in the Byzantine state's subduing of the clergy's influence.[100] Unlike the situation in the West, the Byzantine clergy was divided, not united. The strict monastic group first gained victory but then quickly fell under the dominance of the state. Troitskii also took an interest in the internal struggle between the partisans of the eastern tradition and the proponents of western innovations during and following the era of the union of the Council of Lyons.[101] He was also attentive to the life of contemporary Orthodoxy in the East.

Vasilii Bolotov combined a gift for history with the theologian's penetration, a combination most apparent in his first book on Origen, which he wrote as a student.[102] This work, which draws on primary sources that the author could make come alive, provides an exhaustive and exemplary analysis of Origen's doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Origen himself seems to breathe life, as if he was speaking aloud. His portrait is shown against the living background and in the living line of classical writers and theologians. Bolotov gives a subtle and thorough analysis of the relationship between Arianism and Origenism—the historical analysis of a theologian. Theological sensitivity makes the analysis expecially convincing. The book appeared the same year that Lebedev's dissertation came out, and a comparison from the methodological viewpoint is very instructive. Bolotov's first book remained the most significant in his literary legacy. He did not write a second major work. During the 1880s he worked on sources for a history of Nestorianism, but he did not bring his research to a conclusion at that time, as it was forbidden to write about "heresies" and "heretics."

Bolotov died in middle age, leaving behind a series of highly intelligent essays on various themes, primarily dealing with the history of the non-Greek East. They testify to all of his brilliant analytical gifts. One should especially note his "theses" on the *filioque*, composed for the synodal commission on the Old Catholic question.[103] He came to the conclusion that, out of respect for the authority of the blessed Augustine, the western doctrine might be admitted and tolerated as a private theological opinion, even though its meaning does not coincide with the basic eastern (or Cappadocian) "*theologoumenon*" "through the Son." The theological disagreement over the doctrine

of the procession of the Holy Spirit did not constitute the chief or decisive reason for the break between Byzantium and Rome. Bolotov had more than a historian's interest in the "division of the Churches." As a youth he translated one of J. Joseph Overbeck's books on Romanism and Orthodoxy, adding notes that indicate a personal interest.[104]

His lectures at the academy, published posthumously from student notes, provide the best testimony about Bolotov as a historian. Volume four of his history of theological thought during the period of the ecumenical councils is particularly important. It expresses in full measure his gift for historical composition and conveys his deep penetration as a theologian. One immediately senses that his schemata have been methodically tested in all their parts and details. One always feels a special reliability and confidence in him. A good many students were always working with him. He loved to guide their studies, and had the ability to do so. The topics he chose for them invariably had a methodological angle. Above all, he tried to teach them how one should relate to sources.

Bolotov's school was one of historical method and experiment. The historical method reveals multiplicity and plasticity in the Church's past. One may not dumbly refer to the past as proof of "constancy." In any case, over the centuries we see not only "constancy" but growth, creativity, and development in the life of the Church. Canonical order, theological self-awareness, liturgical office, the *Typikon*, custom, spiritual exploit, and much else in the life of the Church turn out to be historical, changing, growing, living, and taking shape in them. And from the plasticity of the past one might naturally draw conclusions about the plasticity of the present. Archeological investigations thereby acquire a practical acuteness, and a question arises: how is fidelity to tradition to be reconciled with the demands of creative life? From as early as the 1850s all Russian church historians either expressed or implied this question.

Liturgics became a historical discipline, while "church antiquities" in the style of the older erudites was no longer found to be satisfying. Scholars directed their attention to the liturgical order of later Byzantine and early Russian history. For this new and often unpublished material had to be acquired. Fr. Aleksandr Gorskii already had a vital sense of this when describing the liturgical manuscripts in the Synodal Library. Among those who made specialized studies were Ivan D. Mansvetov, Nikolai F. Krasnosel'tsev, Konstantin T. Nikol'skii, and Aleksei A. Dmitrievskii.[105] Later, in the 1890s, during a journey to the Near East, Dmitrievskii was able to collect exceedingly rich and

almost untouched material on the history of the Byzantine liturgy. He diverted his students at the Kiev Academy to work on this material. Initiative in searching out eastern manuscripts also belongs to Bishop Porfirii Uspenskii (1804-1885). He spent many years on official mission at Constantinople, Mt. Athos, and Palestine, returning to Russia with a rich collection of Greek manuscripts, ancient icons, and other artifacts. Scholars still have not fully utilized these materials.[106]

A man of an acute and, still more, restless mind, Porfirii was more an antiquarian and an erudite than a researcher. Nonetheless, even without a critical school his numerous studies laid firm factual foundations for the subsequent elaboration of Byzantine church history. In this connection one must also mention Archimandrite Antonii (Kapustin, 1818-1894), Bishop Arsenii (Ivashchenko, 1830-1903), Bishop Amfilokii (Sergievskii, 1818-1893), Archbishop Makarii (Miroliubov, 1817-1894), and Archbishop Sergii (Spasskii, 1830-1904). They were more collectors than scholars, yet their contribution to the history of Russian scholarship should not be passed over in silence.[107]

The history of the "Old Ritual," so hastily and incautiously condemned in its own day, provoked particular interest, and in the light of history that "rite" appeared more justifiable. By the same token, it became clearer that the real acuteness of Russia's "Old Ritualism" lay not so much in the "Old Rite" as in an ill and false sense of the Church.

One should also recall the work on the history of Byzantine and old Russian church art, a new discipline that displaced the old "archeology" and was largely created through the efforts of the Russian scholars Fedor I. Buslaev, Nikolai V. Pokrovskii, Nikodim P. Kondakov, and others.[108] Their manner of constant comparison of literary and material evidence was highly important for methodology.
ology.

The historical method was also carried over into the study of church law, a development already anticipated in Ioann Sokolov's analysis of canonical sources. His continuators expressed it even more powerfully. Questions about the history of penance caused special interest. Here we should mention Aleksei S. Pavlov, Archpriest Mikhail I. Gorchakov, Nikolai S. Suvorov, Nikolai Zaoverskii, Timofei V. Barsov, V.F. Kiparisov, and Il'ia Berdnikov.[109] Questions about the "mutability" of canon law and the "canonicity" of the existing synodal structure were also often raised.

Thus, an ecclesiastical self-awareness was developed within the historical school and theologians were left to draw their own conclusions from the new experience.

VII

DOGMA: THE MEANING OF CHURCH HISTORY

The developing interest in church history was immediately reflected in the elaboration of dogmatic or systematic theology. As early as the 1830s and 1840s the use of the "historical method" had become habitual. Strictly speaking, however, it was often far removed from the true meaning of the "historical" method. In most cases the method was more that of the so-called "positive theology"—an attentive selection and review of all texts and evidence in chronological order. Such is the case with Makarii's dogmatic study.[110] The use of "historical" material is not always the same thing as historical research. "Historicism" is present only when a study accepts the testimony of sources not only as dogmatic proof but also as historical evidence, in all its temporal uniqueness and living historical context. In other words, "historicism" in theological methodology is connected to the idea of "development." Learning how to understand and differentiate the historical coloration of texts means very little. One must also learn to see the organic bond between texts, the unity that reveals life. Quite characteristic in this regard is the question of the "orthodoxy" [*pravoverie*] of the pre-Nicean writers, the apologists in particular, who confused and upset the seventeenth-century erudites. In more recent times, with the awakening of genuine historical feeling, this question has lost its cutting edge.[111]

The problem of the "historical method" was first raised in Russian theological literature in the form of a question about the "authority of the Holy Fathers" and the dogmatic significance of patristic testimony. During Count Protasov's tenure as over-procurator the St. Petersburg Academy was always inclined to accept every patristic system as dogmatic testimony or as an expression of Holy Scripture.[112] The Moscow school responded with a voice of caution. Metropolitan Filaret insisted that patristic testimony must be accepted only on a scriptural basis and not in any autonomous capacity. Filaret Gumilevskii underscored the fact that the writings of the fathers are not monuments of dogma but before anything else the living confession of their faith and experience. It was from this point of view that the Moscow Academy feared the transformation of patrology into theology. However, what stands out in all this is historical relativity

and subjectivity rather than development. Aleksandr Gorskii had already noted the fact of development in his lectures on dogmatics.

> How should one view Christian dogmatics? Is it really true that in the number of explained truths and in the definitions of these truths dogma has always been one and the same? When dogma is seen as divine thought it is single and immutable, in and of itself complete, clear, and precise. But when dogma is seen as divine thought that has been or is still being acquired by the human mind, then its dimensions must grow with the passing of time. It affects man's various relations, encounters one or another of his thoughts, and in so doing explains them and is itself explained. Contradictions and objections drive man from his tranquility and compel him to discover the divine energy of dogma. People might not understand it and reject it for centuries, but in the end dogma wins out. Even when falsehood seems victorious dogma has not been conquered, for the new discoveries of the human mind in the realm of truth and its experience, which grows by degrees, add clarity to it. What one could earlier doubt is now indubitable and resolved. Thus, each dogma has its own sphere that, with the passage of time, grows into more and more intimate contact with the other parts of Christian dogma and with other principles present in the human mind. All of this grows together and is incarnated in a single large body, enlivened by a single spirit. The entire realm of the mind is illumined, and all sciences, as they come into closer contact with dogma, thereby gain in precision and in positive quality. In time, a strict system of knowledge becomes more and more possible. This is the course of the development of dogma; this is its life—the life of this heavenly star![113]

In the 1860s the "historical" current began to be particularly felt in the teaching of dogmatics. The 1869 statute specifically directed that dogmatic theology be taught "with a historical exposition of dogmas."[114]

A.L. Katanskii (1836-1919) taught dogmatics for many years at the St. Petersburg Academy. A graduate of the St. Petersburg Academy, he spent several years at the beginning of his academic career teaching archeology and liturgics at the Moscow Academy, and there imbibed the atmosphere of historical study.[115] In his memoirs he

himself notes the influence of Gorskii, who supplied him with some parting advice at the time of his transfer to St. Petersburg to teach dogmatics. Among foreign authorities he most closely followed Klee and Kahnis.[116] Katanskii explicitly posed the question of the historical aspect of dogma. The "form" or "formal design" of dogma has a history. Immutable dogma, as revealed truth, experienced growth in this formal aspect, for the shapes or formulas in which it was originally cast proved too narrow for the truth revealed in them. Thus they inevitably expanded. This meant the amplification or elaboration of a more perfect language or vocabulary; it meant a "dogmatic-philological task." Katanskii immediately added the rather incautious remark that "imperfect human language is incapable of providing fully precise expressions," and, still more strongly, "the ecclesiastico-historical formulation of dogma and its demonstration in dogmatics is a secondary matter." What is important for dogmatic theology is not the letter, but the meaning of the letter, "the meaning that combined with a known truth at a time when a known formula still did not exist." Everything historical is too hastily put off into the realm of the unsubstantial.

Katanskii's essay "On the Historical Exposition of Dogmas" was a bold manifesto for its time. His teaching, however, contained little that was "historical." Historicism was confined by his careful delimitation of evidence according to epochs and by the separation of "biblical theology" from "church" or "patristic" theology, although he did not discount their organic and unbroken ties, etc. Methodologically this was very useful, for it fostered a habit of reading each piece of information only for what it contained, without investing it with some dim meaning through analogies. These characteristics were especially embodied in his later book on grace, as well as his dissertation on the sacraments according to the teachings of the fathers and writers of the first three centuries (in which, in a special appendix, he notes that the numbering of the sacraments at seven is of western medieval origin and at a comparatively late date was imitated in the East). They are of value in that the author supplies a highly attentive comparison of the individual texts surveyed. Such "dogmatico-philological" analysis, in any event, facilitated a later synthesis, in spite of the fact that the analyst confined himself to a mere "codification" of his data. Katanskii was convinced that the writings of the fathers were the "sole means of enlivening our feeble and impoverished theological thought." At first he wanted to elaborate a "biblical theology," to write a "biblical dogmatics," but he was afraid of becoming known as a Protestant.[117]

Archimandrite Sil'vestr Malevanskii (1828-1908) taught dogmatics at the Kiev Academy under the new statute.[118] He published his lectures, in bold relief setting off the title: *An Experiment in Orthodox Dogmatic Theology through a Historical Exposition of Dogma.*[119] Sil'vestr apparently proceeded from the dogmatic experience of the Church, from a "general religious awareness of the ecumenical Church," because of Khomiakov's influence. The historian's task is to trace and demonstrate how this experience solidified in dogmatic definitions and theological formulas. In such an understanding dogma is demonstrated not only by external data, but by the inner design of ecclesiastical thought. The student of dogma must go beyond simple positive references to the past, to historical texts and evidence. He must depict the very process by which revealed truth, in its inner dialectic and specific historical context, is discerned. Truth is not revealed to man so that he might give it formal recognition without applying his mind to it, and preserve it like some immovable treasure. Fidelity to apostolic tradition does not mean it should be preserved "only in lifeless immobility." Dogma has been given as revelation and is acquired through faith. Simple agreement with or acceptance of dogma as external data remains insufficient. Man is saved only by living faith, the acquisition of revealed truth "through religious feeling" and a consciousness that "realizes the dogmas of faith within the nature of our spirit." Only by a conscious acquisition do dogmas become for man that which they should be, "become for him the true light, illuminating his dark depths, and a new living principle, introducing into his nature a new true life to be transmitted throughout man's entire spiritual composition." Otherwise, dogma becomes like the "good seed falling on rocky ground." Dogma must be inwardly acquired and assimilated by consciousness or the intellect. "Reason cannot create new dogmas, but through its independent activity it can grasp the prepared data of dogma and convert it into its own private possession, into its own nature and life." Reason "raises to the level of knowledge" that which is directly accepted by faith. The Church gives witness to dogma, clothes the truth of revelation in the most precise and appropriate form, and in so doing "raises it to the level of undoubted, incontestable truth." The fulness of divine truth is contained in a given dogma from the very outset, but it must be made manifest, discerned, and acknowledged. Therein lies the entire importance of the historical activity of thought. "Dogmas, now confronted by a reason that studies them, appear not in the pure and original form they had when first contained in divine revelation, but in a form more or less developed and shaped as they passed through the long and quite complex process of con-

sciousness during the many centuries of the Church's existence." The dogmatician must grasp or demonstrate dogma in the inner "dialectic" of this "process of consciousness" within the Church.

Sil'vestr did not completely fulfill his plans. His historical analysis often lacks sufficient depth. He conscientiously gathered and elaborated patristic materials, yet the biblical history of dogma is practically missing, and the transition from "apostolic preaching" to the "dogmas of the fathers" remains unexplained. In any case, his work remains a very significant step forward and "away from Makarii." "It was as if a gust of fresh air, blowing with energetic force and expansiveness, burst into a stifling room."[120]

Contacts with the "Old Catholics" provided fresh grounds for posing the question of the meaning of dogmatic development for dogmatics and theology. Individual representatives of the Russian Church participated in the first Old Catholic conferences at Cologne, Constance, Freiburg, and Bonn between 1872 and 1875. Discussion of conditions for a possible "reunification" of the Old Catholics with the Orthodox Church naturally led to the historico-theological question of development, albeit in the guise of a question about "obligatory" and "admissible" limits and standards in the Church. First one had to define the character and content of the "ecumenical awareness of the Church" and find means for reliably distinguishing and delimiting the "local" and the "ecumenical" within tradition. The teachings of the fathers were adopted as a standard of confession. True, specific instances of dogmatic differences or disagreements immediately became the subject of investigation, and the Bonn conference of 1875 devoted its primary efforts to the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Yet throughout it was assumed that the basic issue was the meaning and limits of the "mutable" or "changing" and the "immutable" in the doctrines of faith, the preservation of tradition and the right to engage in theological commentary.

This theological encounter with the West produced a quite lively reflection in Russian theological literature. Fr. I.L. Ianyshev, who had previously served at the Russian church in Weisbaden and was at that time rector of the St. Petersburg Academy, Professor Ivan T. Osinin, formerly psalmist in Copenhagen, and Aleksandr A. Kireev particularly sympathized with the Old Catholics and facilitated closer contacts with them.[121] Characteristically, general opinion inclined to oppose the principle of dogmatic development, This was a result of a repulsion for "Vatican dogma." Under the fresh impression of the Vatican Council the principle of development in dogmatics was perceived more as a means for loosening the framework of the "oblig-

atory" in faith and converting "local" or private opinion into "ecumenical" dogma. The principle of tradition—the preservation and guarding of the "ancient faith" in the form it was revealed in the epoch of the ecumenical councils, in the "undivided Church," prior to the division of the churches—was persistently counterposed to the principle of development.

The question of "dogmatic development" was again raised with a new urgency in the 1880s by Vladimir Solov'ev—once more in this same "Roman" context, as a means for justifying the dogmatic development of the Roman Church. This prevented many from penetrating to the very essence of the question. Solov'ev's truth, however, lay in his living sense of the sacred reality of history in the Church.

> When proceeding from an understanding of the Church as the body of Christ (not in the sense of a metaphor, but as a metaphysical formula), we must remember that this body necessarily grows and develops, and consequently it changes and becomes perfected. Although it is the body of Christ, the Church has still not become his glorious, sanctified body in all its fulness. . . . But as the living body of Christ, it possesses the elements of a future perfect life. . . . In the historical reality of the visible Church, this sacred body had already from the outset been granted everything, but not everything has been manifested or revealed. Only gradually is it manifested or revealed. In keeping with the gospel analogy, this ecumenical body (the kingdom of God) has been granted to us as a divine seed. The seed is not a part or an individual organ of a living body—it is the entire body, only in its possibility or potential, i.e., in a concealed and undifferentiated condition that is gradually revealed. In material phenomena this disclosure manifests only that which in and of itself was from the beginning already contained in the seed as a form taking shape and as a vital force.

Development does not destroy, but presupposes the identity of that which is developing. Development is the disclosure of a living idea. It means fulfillment rather than alteration. The organism lives not by change, but by mutual preservation of its parts. And this organic wholeness or catholicity is peculiarly characteristic of ecclesiastical development.

Solov'ev had already spoken of this in *The Religious Foundations of Life* [*Religioznye osnovy zhizni*], without any reference to the problem of uniting the churches.[122] In this book he does not refer specifically to "dogmatic development," but only establishes a general principle.

> If it is an essential condition of ecclesiasticity that nothing new contradicts the old, then this is so not because it is old, but because it is the product and expression of that same Spirit of God who uninterruptedly acts within the Church and who cannot contradict himself. . . . We accept and respect that which is traditional in the Church not merely because it has been handed down (for there are also harmful traditions), but also because we acknowledge in tradition not just the product of a certain time, place, or person, but the work of that Spirit of God who is always and everywhere indivisibly present, filling everything, and testifying in us about the fact that at one time he created it [the work] in the ancient Church. Therefore we acknowledge the truth that was expressed earlier, but which is always a single truth, by the power of the grace of that same Spirit who expressed it then. Consequently, every form and every resolution, even though expressed at a specific time and through specific people—provided that in this matter these people did not act for themselves or in their own name but for everyone and in the name of the entire Church past, present, and future, visible and invisible—proceeds according to our faith from the present and actual within the entire Church of the Spirit of Christ and therefore must be acknowledged as holy and immutable, as proceeding in truth not from any single part or locality of the Church at any one time, not from its individual members in their particularity or individuality, but from the entire Church of God in its indivisible unity and wholeness, as containing the entire fulness of divine grace.

This passage expresses Solov'ev's undoubted closeness to Khomiakov, even in literary style.

Solov'ev writes in the same vein about dogmatic development in his book *The History and Future of Theocracy*, published in Zagreb.[123] Strictly speaking, he goes no farther at this point than Vincent de Lérins.[124] For Solov'ev, "dogmatic development" consists

of the fact that the original "pledge of faith," while remaining totally inviolate and unaltered, is increasingly disclosed and clarified for the human consciousness. "The Church cannot and has not added anything to the inner truth contained in these dogmatic propositions, but has made them clear and incontestable for all Orthodox believers." Solov'ev's opponents would still not argue against this–they only presented this growing perfection of ecclesiastical definitions in history as something fully relative and secondary, simply because of its historicity. Such a sharp break between the two sides of church life–that of man and that of grace–was for Solov'ev unthinkable. Like the body of Christ, i.e., precisely in its twofold unity, the Church grows and becomes. "The relative changes in the operation of divine forces, namely the degree to which this operation is conditioned by human receptivity, inescapably correspond to the changes in human receptivity." This statement represents a simple application of the basic truth about "synergy," or the co-action of "nature" and "grace."

The question of the meaning of church history provided the underlying acuteness of the debate with Solov'ev. His opponents always spoke of history negatively, as an overly simple and humanistic scheme. It is precisely divine assistance that is not a thread in the historical fabric. This negative presentation is linked to a debased sense of the Church. In this connection, the polemic with Solov'ev in the Khar'kov journal *Faith and Reason* [*Vera i razum*] is particularly characteristic.[125] The polemic's interest lies precisely in the fact that here were people without original views debating with Solov'ev. The average man, as it were, quarreled with him. Through their efforts to guard inviolable that tradition which was from the beginning, i.e., Holy Scripture, his opponents inescapably arrived at a lower valuation of the ecumenical councils. In an unexpectedly acrimonious way they insisted that the councils had no "special" assistance from the Holy Spirit, and had no need for it. The councils only protected tradition and clarified it relative to the "passing needs of the Church at that moment." Therefore, ecumenical testimony has largely a negative significance: the condemnation and exclusion of definite heresies or errors. The "extraordinary action" of the Spirit was curtailed when the New Testament canon was finished and concluded. The holy apostles transferred divine doctrine "intact" to their successors in oral and written tradition. As Solov'ev understood it, the ecumenical councils defined and described with new precision and binding authority that Christian truth which had existed from the beginning, and their importance and novelty lies in this precision and authoritativeness–this new degree or stage of exactness.

For Solov'ev's opponents the councils merely brought down heretics. The entire fulness of truth was almost literally concentrated for them in early Christianity. They seemed determined to speak about an apostolic "catalogue of dogma." No further growth took place throughout the subsequent history of the Church. Even more pronounced was the bold surmise that dogmatic definitions indicate a certain weakening of ecclesiastical life. "Is it right to see the development of truth in the fact that among us its dogmas have been recorded in precise definitions?" And did not "recording and defining" become necessary because in general the original "vividness" of the apostolic conception had been lost? Obviously, the successors to the apostless "could not apprehend divinely revealed truth as vividly and distinctly as did the apostles themselves, for they did not see the Lord or hear his words with their own ears; moreover, they lacked the many small details available to direct witnesses, which unconsciously enter the soul of the eyewitness and lend vitality and power to his impressions." The process of forgetting subsequently continued. "Thus it went farther, the concrete vitality of truth disappeared, leaving behind only formulas and words, and words, as everyone knows, never fully express a real phenomenon." The only way out of this otherwise inescapable process lay in strengthening apostolic memories. "Thus, our dogmas, i.e., our dogmatic formulas, are not indications of any development or progress, but rather the opposite: they are signs of regression, testimony to the fact that the truth began to fade in the consciousness of believers and consequently had to be strengthened by verbal definitions."[126] The entire discussion is a variation on the typical theme of Protestant historiography: church history as decay. Solov'ev's opponents brought too much evidence against him.

Solov'ev's truth lay in the fact that he established a method for dogmatic theology. He stood closer to Bishop Sil'vestr than did his critics, and is not greatly distinguishable from him. The same feeling for ecclesiasticity—a common turning toward the experience of the Church—drew them together and gave them life. In the experience of the Church the fulness of truth has been granted all at once, but it is only gradually discerned, dissected, and described in necessary definitions. Each dogmatic system constitutes such a "disclosure" of one part of the single and primary truth of Christianity about the God-man. "Dogmatic dissection of the single Christian truth is the controlling fact of church history from the beginning of the fourth century to the end of the eighth. The purpose of instruction in the faith did not consist in revealing new truths, but in newly disclosing one and

the same original truth." The significance of the conciliar definitions of faith lies not so much in their antiquity ("on the contrary, in a certain sense they were novel"), but in their truthfulness: "They were accepted by the power of their inner ties with the fundamental data of Christian revelation." Solov'ev himself noted that he had substantial differences with his opponents about how to understand the apostolic witness of the Church as the body of Christ—in a direct and real, although mysterious sense, or only metaphorically. His opponents exhibited, on the one hand, a highly pronounced aspiration to curb the Church's capacity to teach, and, on the other, they obviously exaggerated the permanence and finality of ancient traditions.

Solov'ev constantly strove to bring a theological understanding to his primary sources: the experience and teaching of the Church. "Orthodoxy preserves not only the past, but God's eternally living Spirit." Here Solov'ev meets Khomiakov.

> The forthright and clear decisions of the ecumenical Church have for us more than a formal significance or outer authority. We see in them a real and vital manifestation of divinely affirmed power conditioned by the authentic and living operation of the Holy Spirit. . . .Each genuine member of the Church morally participates in its decisions with confidence in and love for the great divine-human wholeness in its living representations. Without this moral participation of the flock, the very people of God, in the dogmatic acts of the ecumenical Church, pastors could not exercise their spiritual power properly, and God's own Spirit would not find in the Church that combination of love and freedom through which his operation is acquired. Each decision of the ecumenical Church, being its own action emanating from the abiding Spirit of God, constitutes a step forward on the path of its inner development, its growth and perfection in the fulness of Christ's stature. . . .The development of the Church's instruction in matters of faith (in tandem with the Church's general development) is not a theory, but a fact that cannot seriously be denied while remaining on historical ground.

Solov'ev left behind an incontestable methodological service. Only by the historical or "genetic" method can a system of ecclesiology be constructed. His adversaries proved to have no such method. Professor Aleksei I. Vvedenskii later sharply criticized Russian dogmaticians

for their methodological backwardness and impotence.[127] He pointed out the total insufficiency of simply citing texts and evidence, authority and obedience. The dogmatician must construct a "genetic" method. Above all, he must spiritually perceive the question that each dogma answers. "This [is the task]: the analysis of natural spiritual interests relative to this or that truth." The positive testimony of the Church must then be established from Scripture and tradition. "This will not yield a mosaic of texts, but an organic growth of understanding." Dogma will then come alive and be revealed in all its profound depths. First, it will be revealed as a divine answer to a human inquiry, as a divine "amen." Second, it will be revealed as the witness of the Church. Finally, it will appear as a "self-evident truth," which it is spiritually unthinkable and tortuous to contradict. "Dogmatics, moving toward an encounter with contemporary needs, must therefore constantly create dogmas as if anew, transforming the black coal of traditional formulas into the translucent and self-radiating jewels of the truth of faith." Thus, the historical method must be fused with philosophy.

VIII

THE IDEAL OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

The philosophical crisis of the 1860s also found expression in theology. Moral themes obscured metaphysical ones. Bringing the Church "closer to life," so much talked about at the time, could be understood in quite different ways. It could mean the Church's authority over the world, as Vladimir Solov'ev later termed "theocracy"—the attempt to bring culture into the Church and thereby renovate it—or it could mean adapting the Church to the world, accepting and acquiring secular and existing culture as it had been historically formed. Too often, and rather naively, Russians decided this question in the second sense. Thus, Russian church liberalism tended more and more to identify itself with worldly life and daily existence rather than with theology. This was a naive or "dogmatic" acceptance and justification of worldly and even mundane well-being, a "secular religion" in the literal sense of the term, without the benefit of ascetic verification. One is easily convinced that this "secular" spirit derived from a German source, that it was simply an adaptation or supplement

to the patriarchal pietism of the contemporary cult of common good works and commodiousness characteristic of Protestant Germany in the 1840s and even in the 1860s. Numerous books on "good works" were adapted or translated at that time from German into Russian.

Russians of that time learned "Christian morality" precisely from German pamphlets. Under the 1867 statute, the seminary program in moral theology was drawn up in accordance with Christian Palmer's "system," with Richard Rothe's "theological ethics" highly recommended.[128] The Moscow Academy (still under the influence of Fr. Fedor Golubinskii) adhered to Johann Sailer, while at the Kazan Academy Filaret Filaretov lectured on moral theology according to De Wette.[129] Platon Fiveiskii's textbook on moral theology, which appeared in 1854, was compiled primarily from Stapf's Catholic system, published simultaneously in German and Latin in the 1840s.[130] Platon also translated the *Memorial Book for Priests,* published in Latin by the Mechitaristen in Vienna.[131] Archpriest P.F. Soliarskii's textbook, *Notes on Orthodox Moral Theology*, issued in the 1860s, was also compiled from German handbooks, both Catholic and Protestant.[132] Subsequently Hans Martensen's famous system was translated from Danish (as was his book on dogmatics).[133] A similar influence of foregin handbooks can be detected in Russian literature on pastoral theology. The usual reassessment of the moral moment is quite characteristic. Thus, Archimandrite Kirill Naumov's *Pastoral Theology* [*Pastyrskoe bogoslovie*, St. Petersburg, 1853] was constructed as a "systematic exposition of the moral obligations of the church pastor."

The insufficiency and imprecision of such a definition was noted at the time. A pastor has obligations higher than "moral" ones–he also has sacramental obligations. Archimandrite Kirill did not write under foreign influences, but his book reflected the spirit of the times, and this is repeated in the subsequent period. In the 1860s and 1870s the practical pastoral journal *Handbook for Village Clergy* carried fewer articles about performing the liturgy than about how to solve involved and extraordinary cases "from pastoral practice," or, most of all, about the Church's teaching duties. Patristic material was adjusted to this trend. Quite characteristically, the 1867 statute eliminated pastoral theology in the seminaries (it had been introduced into the program as a separate subject under Protasov in 1838), and replaced it with "practical quidance for pastors." Pastoral theology also underwent development in the academies. Curiously, laymen such as Professor V.F. Pevnitskii, who held the chair at the Kiev Academy for many years, often taught this subject.[134]

The most typical representative of moralizing Christianity and laicized religiosity in academy instruction was the archpriest and professor Ioann L. Ianyshev (1826-1910), who had been apointed rector of St. Petersburg Academy after its reform. He had earlier served as a priest-in-residence abroad, at one time lectured on theology and philosophy at St. Petersburg University, and subsequently became court protopresbyter and confessor. His ideal was the theological faculties of the German universities. It was highly indicative that he chose to teach moral theology and pedagogics at the academy, for the rector conventionally lectured on dogmatics. Ianyshev inaugurated his course of instruction with a lecture on his predecessors based on the text: "The scribes and Pharisees occupy the chair of Moses" (Matthew 23:2). His audience understood that he meant Makarii and Ioann.

Ianyshev's teaching came as a surprise and seemed much too bold. The academy's council was hard put to approve for publication its rector's doctoral thesis, presented in manuscript in 1872 under the title "The State of Doctrine on Conscience, Freedom, and Grace in the Orthodox System of Theology, and an Attempt to Clarify that Doctrine" ["Sostoianie ucheniia o sovesti, svobode, i blagodati v pravoslavnoi sisteme bogosloviia i popytka k raz"iasneniiu etogo ucheniia"]. Ianyshev's treatise was written in the form of a critical selection of dogmatic definitions, discussing the conceptions found in the patriarchal charters, the *Orthodox Confession*, the catechism, St. John of Damascus, and "illustrious" Russian handbooks (such as Makarii's). Ianyshev did not find "sufficiently precise teaching" in these books and preferred to seek this precision by another, psychologico-philosophical method. The official reviewers of his manuscript found that his views "sometimes, at least in appearance, do not coincide with the teachings on these subjects expounded in our theological systems and symbolical books." The academy's council, therefore, found it difficult, in view of its responsibilities, to permit publication of a book whose point of departure was a judgment and criticism of "those expositions of the faith authorized by the blessing of the Holy Synod."[135] The work came to a complete halt in the Synod due to the "significant lack of correspondence" of the teachings it develops with what is generally accepted and with the symbolical books.[136] The Synod's judgment on Ianyshev's book was delivered by Makarii, and Ianyshev was able to publish his lectures only at the end of the 1880s.

It is very interesting to compare Ianyshev's course with the moral theology expounded by Bishop Feofan (Govorov, 1815-1894),

his predecessor at the St. Petersburg Academy. Their books deal with quite different subjects, and the differences are typical. In essence, Ianyshev expounds a natural morality in a very optimistic spirit, passing it off as Orthodox morality. It is above all a justification of the world. "Earthly blessings" are admitted as a necessary means, outside of which moral growth is impossible, "that without which good works are impossible." This does not refer only to property and wealth in all their aspects, but also to the actual "satisfaction" accompanying this acquisition and possession, and all "earthly joys." From this standpoint, monasticism and asceticism cannot be approved. In the contemplative mysticism of the ascetics Ianyshev found only quietism, and termed "asceticism" the working power of reason and will over everything external and unfree; in other words, the elaboration of character (compare this with *die innerweltliche Askese* in Protestantism).[137] According to this exegesis, "asceticism" turns out to be nearly identical with "worldly wisdom." Ianyshev's views were certainly not original–he merely continued the tradition of "simplified Orthodoxy," whose leading representative in the previous generation had been Archpriest Pavskii.[138]

An attempt was subsequently made to newly construct moral theology as the doctrine of the spiritual life. Contemplative monasticism had taken on a new life in Russia since the beginning of the nineteenth century, largely under the influence of the disciples of the great starets Paisii Velichkovskii, who had now found homes in a variety of Russian hermitages and sketes.[139] The institution of *starchestvo* [eldership] restored mental construction, in answer to a deeply existing need. Many among the most diverse social strata of Russian society and among the people were seized by the quest for the spiritual life. The question of a personal way, of a Christian personality, was very acutely and sharply posed. The new current quickly became noticeable and detectable in everything. The "Russian monk" did not accidentally appear in Dostoevskii's synthesis, nor is it an accident that at the Optina hermitage the paths of Gogol, the older Slavophiles, Konstantin Leont'ev, Dostoevskii, Vladimir Solov'ev, Strakhov, and even Tolstoi, who went there in an hour of mute anguish and unfathomable torment just before his death, intersect.[140]

The Optina hermitage was not the only spiritual ember, just as the "Moldavian influence" was neither the sole nor decisive one. There was also the mysterious attendance of the Holy Spirit. The turn of the nineteenth century, in any event, bears the marks and signs of a certain inner and mysterious movement in the destiny of the Russian Church. The prophetic figure of St. Serafim of Sarov

(1759-1833) bears witness to this through his spiritual exploits, joy, and teaching.[141] This model of freshly revealed sanctity long remained an enigmatic figure. Ascetic struggle and joy, the burden of battle in prayer and heavenly ethereality, the prefiguration of an unworldly light, marvelously combined to fashion this figure. An infirm and frail starets, "wretched Serafim" testifies to the mysteries of the Spirit with an unexpected daring. He was more of a witness than a teacher, but even more than that, his being and his whole life are manifestations of the Spirit. There is an inner affinity between Serafim and St. Tikhon. But St. Serafim, with his bold summons to seek the gifts of the Spirit, more readily recalls the ancient mystical visionaries, particularly St. Symeon.[142] He was deeply read in the fathers, and an immemorial tradition of searching out the Spirit is renewed in his experience.

St. Serafim's sanctity is at once ancient and modern. "The true aim of our Christian life consists in acquiring the Holy Spirit of God." No other aims exist or are possible–everything else can only be means. When speaking of the insufficient quantity of oil among the foolish virgins in the gospel parable he did not understand good works, but rather precisely the grace of the Holy Spirit. "By performing good deeds, those virgins, through their spiritual folly, supposed that Christianity consists only of doing good works. . . . Whether they received the grace of God's Spirit or whether they achieved it was of no consequence." Spirituality is thus forcefully counterposed to moralism. Meaning and fulfillment in the Christian life consist of the Spirit's dwelling in the human soul and transforming it "into a temple of God, into a glowing ember of eternal rejoicing." These are practically the words of St. Symeon, for the experience is wholly the same (one need not suggest literary influence). The Spirit reaches out, but is also insistent. Ascetic struggle, possession, is demanded. Grace reaching out is made manifest in a certain ineffable light.[143] St. Serafim inwardly belongs to the Byzantine tradition, which once again fully came to life in him.

In the development of the Russian Church sanctity and learning had become disconnected. Starets Paisii's tradition partially revealed the possibility of a new union and fusion. Most important was the creative restoration of the interrupted contemplative and ascetical tradition of Byzantium, which found readiest expression in literature. In the 1840s the Optina hermitage undertook the publication of the patristic translations made by starets Paisii and his disciples. These works still remained in manuscript, although they were circulating quite widely in handmade copies. The Optina starets Fr. Makarii (1788-1860) and Ivan Kireevskii took the initiative in publishing

them.[144] Fr. Fedor Golubinskii, who could be very useful in his capacity and duties as ecclesiastical censor, and professor S.P. Shevyrev supported the project. Filaret of Moscow proved quite sympathetic, although he later became somewhat disturbed. "Don't the people at Optina want to publish rather too much at one time?" Golubinskii explained that they were hurrying in order to utilize his participation and help, "without which undoubtedly nothing would be published."

The first work to appear was starets Paisii's *Life* [*Zhitie,* 1847], with an appendix containing several of his letters and writings as well as those of his friend Vasilli Polianomerul'skii. An essay on Paisii had been published earlier in the *Muscovite* [*Moskvitianin*, December 1845]. The translations of Paisii and others that were then published included Nikifor Feotokii's catechetical sermons; Nil Sorskii's *Tradition to the Disciples*; Barsanuphius and John, *Questions and Answers*; the sermons of St. Symeon the New Theologian; Theodore the Studite's catechetical instructions; Maxim the Confessor, *Sermon on Love* (in Tertii Filippov's translation); the writings of Isaac the Syrian; Thalasius; Dorotheus (in Fr. Kliment Zedergol'm's translation); the sermons of Mark the Hermit; the sermons of Orsisius (translated from the Latin by Fr. Kliment); the life of St. Gregory of Sinai, and others.[145] Besides those mentioned above, the monastic brothers participating in the work of translation included Fr. Leonid Kavelin (later superior of Holy Trinity Monastery), Fr. Iuvenalii Polovtsov (who died as Archbishop of Lithuania), and Fr. Amvrosii Grenkov (1812-1891), who later became famous as a starets at Optina.[146] Under Fr. Amvrosii's supervision a "semi-Slavonic" translation of the *Ladder* was published.[147] Russian authors included St. Ioann Maksimovich's books *The Royal Way of the Cross of the Lord* and the *Heliotropion*, as well as the *Letters and Life of the Elder Makarii.* etc.[148] To a certain degree the publishing at Optina repeated the work of starets Paisii, who himself gathered a circle of translators around him. Within a brief time a series of standard works had been placed into Russia's daily reading for spiritual perusal and meditation. The spiritual demand for these books already existed.

New and independent efforts supplemented the old and previously translated books. Above all, Bishop Ignatii Brianchaninov (1807-1867) must be mentioned. Having entered the monastery as a youth, he quickly advanced up the usual ladder of monastic obediences, and for many years served as the superior of the Sergiev hermitage, not far from St. Petersburg. He then became Bishop of Stavropol in the Caucasus. A strict zealot for the ascetic tradition, he also belonged to Paisii's tradition, through the disciples of the renowned Fr. Leonid

(subsequently an Optina starets). Bishop Ignatii's *Ascetical Experiences* was written with great inspiration and expressiveness. The ideal of spiritual sobriety is traced with a special precaution against dreaminess. But ascetical preparation, humility, and self-rejection do not obscure the mysterious goal of the entire path: the acquisition of the peace of Christ, an encounter of the seeking soul with the heavenly Pilgrim and Guest. "You have come! I do not see the image of your coming, I see your coming." One always senses a struggle in Ignatii against the mystical influences of the Alexandrian age, which were still strong in his day. In his view such a spirituality was seductive, false, and too precipitate, not sober or directed against pride, and he entirely disapproved of the reading of heterodox mystical books, especially the *Imitation of Christ*. He speaks of secular culture with a certain harshness. "Learning is the lamp of the old man."[149] He comes close to "agnosticism." His sermons on renunciation always contain a degree of a certain disillusionment bordering on anguish. Oddly enough, it is not difficult to find traits of that same Alexandrian era in his personal make-up. Perhaps this also explains the sharpness of his negation, his struggle with himself.

In his *Notes* on his Russian trip, William Palmer relates a very interesting story about the Sergiev hermitage in 1840, when Ignatii was superior. Apparently Palmer mostly spoke precisely with Ignatii, and was told with unexpected forthrightness about the inner crisis of the Russian clergy.

> Our clergy are the most accessible of all in the world to new and strange opinions. They read books written by heterodox or unbelieving foreigners, Lutherans and others. The Spiritual Academy is infected with innovating principles, and even "the Christian reading" [i.e., *Khristianskoe chtenie*] is infected by them, though that periodical contains many translations from the old fathers. Russia may be on the point, for all we know, of an explosion of heretical liberalism. There is a fair outside; we have preserved all the rites and ceremonies, and the creed of the early Church: but it is a dead body: there is little life. The secular clergy are kept in a hypocritical orthodoxy only by fear of the people.[150]

This characterization is made interesting by the vitriolic way in which it is embellished. In it one senses how fully the two ecclesiastical traditions–monastic and secular, "black" and "white"– had diverged,

if not actually broken apart. Such a perspective renders Bishop Ignatii's personality, with all his distrustfulness and alienation, more understandable.

However, he was fully contemporary in his psychology and intellectual habits, a fact placed in even bolder relief by his famous debate with Bishop Feofan on the nature of spirits and angels.[151] Ignatii decisively rejected any possibility that any among created beings could be considered fully immaterial. Only the divine could be so considered, and in this connection it is inappropriate to equate or compare created being with God. Finiteness presupposes a certain materiality, a tie with space and time. Finally, the soul is bound to the body and co-extends with it, and one can therefore scarcely suppose that the soul itself is entirely immaterial. The argument partially repeats certain patristic motifs, but the influence of philosophical idealism is still more powerfully present. Ignatii himself refers to relativity in the understanding of matter, in accordance with the doctrines of contemporary science, and identifies the spiritual with the ethereal. "The soul is an ethereal and very thin, volatile body, which has all the appearances of our coarse body, all its members, down to the air and facial features; in a word, a full likeness with it." In any case, this is much more reminiscent of romantic *Naturphilosophie* than patristic tradition. Demons enter and leave a person just like air during breathing. In his objections Feofan particularly emphasized the simplicity of the soul. One could hardly consider consciousness or conscience to be merely some sort of "ether"! There is no reason to make the soul material in order to explain the link between body and soul. It is enough to recognize their dynamic relationship to one another. However, Feofan allowed that the soul is somehow clothed in a certain "cloudiness, slenderness, ethereality." In a theological discussion references to chemistry or mathematics could hardly be convincing. Feofan's arguments fully exhaust the question.

It is no less characteristic that in Ignatii's works the doctrine of the resurrection of the body should remain incompletely expressed. True, he saw throughout nature some sort of mysterious sign or symbol of the "resurrection of the dead." Yet his famous *Sermon on Death* [*Slovo o smerti*, 1863] proceeds just as if there were no resurrection. The disembodiment of the soul is depicted in almost Platonic colors. Death liberates the soul from the shackles of a coarse corporeality. When one recalls that for Ignatii the soul itself is delicately materialized by its nature, then the resurrection turns out to be impossible and unnecessary, actually becoming a new coarsening of life.

A genuine and typical continuer of patristic tradition in asceticism and theology was Feofan Govorov, for a time Bishop of Tambov and later Bishop of Vladimir. He served only a short time as an active hierarch, and then lived in retirement for nearly twenty-eight years at the Vyshensk hermitage in the Tambov Diocese. He led a strict life at the hermitage, and after several years there he confined himself to nearly total isolation, refusing to receive anyone. Hence he is usually regarded as a recluse [*zatvornik*].[152] However, Feofan himself very much disliked it when people spoke of his "seclusion." "They have made my cloister into a place of seclusion.[153] There is nothing of the solitary hermit about it. I have locked myself away so that I would not be bothered—not with a view to the strictest asceticism, but in order to ceaselessly concern myself with books." He always insisted that he refused to receive others "because of a preoccupation with books." "Hence it comes out that I am discovered to be a bookworm and nothing more." Characteristically, in his petition to be tonsured, written while still at the academy, he made reference to theological studies: "Possessing an unflagging zeal for studying theological subjects and for the solitary life, I have taken a vow to dedicate my life to the monastic calling so that in my future service to the Church I can combine the one and the other." It was also for the sake of theology and the solitary life that he later stepped down from the episcopal throne. But in so doing he did not break off written communication with the world. He continued his pastoral and missionary work as a writer. Moreover, his personal correspondence was very extensive. For very many people he became a correspondent-confessor. The significance of Feofan's formally solitary life should not be exaggerated. On the contrary, he cautioned others against making a hasty entry into the life of a recluse.

> When your prayer is so strong that everything will give you sustenance in the heart before God, then you will have seclusion without the solitary's life. . . . Seek this seclusion, but do not make a fuss over it. Behind the doors of solitude one can range over the whole world, or admit the whole world into one's room.

Feofan graduated from the Kiew Academy in the same year as Makarii Bulgakov, and both were tonsured at nearly the same time. Almost simultaneously they were transferred to St. Petersburg Academy, with Feofan holding the post of lecturer in moral and pastoral theology. His systematic work on ascetical literature dates from that

time. He tried to reconstruct the whole of the doctrine on the "Christian life" according to the principles of asceticism found in the Holy Fathers. Subsequently he developed and published the lectures he delivered at that time in the academy; his famous book *The Path to Salvation* was put out in this way.[154] Feofan notes the help and approval given by Ignatii Brianchaninov, at that time an archimandrite in the Sergiev hermitage. The academy, then under the rule of Protasov and rector Afanasii, made Feofan very uncomfortable. Teaching duties heartily sickened him, and it was only when A.V. Gorskii's good friend Evsevii Orlinskii[155] came from Moscow Academy to accept his appointment as rector that he began to feel somewhat better. However, he soon jumped at the chance to reside in Jerusalem as part of the ecclesiastical mission being formed at the time under the supervision of Porfirii Uspenskii, then still an archimandrite.[156] He subsequently returned twice to serve at the St. Petersburg Academy, for the first time briefly as a lecturer on canon law, and finally as rector. The journey to the East proved to be a major event in Feofan's life, extending his ecclesiastical horizons and endowing his worldview with an ecumenical courage, a great spiritual freedom and suppleness, a freedom from cultural context. At the same time Feofan fully mastered Greek.

Feofan's literary activity underwent particular development during his years of seclusion. He immediately drew up a complete program of work. First, he undertook a commentary on the New Testament; second, he decided to translate the *Philokalia* into Russian. This work took twenty years. Feofan only managed to write a commentary on the epistles of St. Paul (with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews). The Gospels, in his opinion, were not in need of commentary as much as reflection–thus he composed his *Gospel History of the Word of God.* Feofan always relied on the commentaries of the Holy Fathers, especially those of Chrysostom and Theodoret, although he enthusiastically employed modern western commentaries and supplied himself with the "most thickheaded" books. He had a special love for English commentaries. His library contained many foreign books, particularly Migne's collection–not only the *Patrologia,* but others of his series–as well as dictionaries, sermon collections, and theological textbooks. Fleury was his favorite among church historians, but he greatly disliked Neander.[157] His erudition was rather old-fashioned, yet his sensitivity and ability to grasp the spirit of primary sources fully made up for this fact. His commentaries mark his contribution to Russian biblical work, and constitute an important addition to the Russian translation of the New Testament.

As early as 1873 Feofan set to work translating ascetical works. Volume one of his Russian *Philokalia* appeared in 1876. Work on the remainder dragged out over many years, with the fifth and final volume coming out only in 1890, followed two years later by the collection *Ancient Monastic Statutes* [*Drevniia inocheskiia ustavy*] as a sort of sixth volume. Feofan's Russian *Philokalia* is not identical with the Greek, and thereby departs from starets Paisii's Slavonic version, which fully reproduced the Greek. Feofan omitted some items present in the Greek collection while adding a great deal that was completely new. Still other portions were retained only in abridged form or in paraphrase. He actually translated the book to be used for daily reading and as a handbook. In addition, he translated St. Symeon the New Theologian's sermons from modern Greek.[158] One should also recall his translation of Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain's *Unseen Warfare*, also from modern Greek.[159] The monks on Mount Athos usually published these books and translations, although some considered Feofan too erudite. "For all the wealth of the intellect, the treasure of simpleness of heart had not been granted."

Feofan also contributed to many Russian religious journals, especially *Reading Useful for the Soul,* and at one time to Askochenskii's *Domestic Conversation*, where, for example, his essays against Ignatii Brianchaninov were published. He expended an enormous amount of time on correspondence. His letters frequently grew into articles or sermons, and one of his most important works, *Letters on the Christian Life,* was composed from private letters originally written to Princess P.S. Lukomskaia and then adapted for publication.[160] Several such collections of his letters were published. Feofan preached a great deal prior to leaving for the monastery, always on the theme of the spiritual life and "how to attune oneself to it."

From his place of solitude Feofan attentively and with disquiet followed the life of the Church outside, and was greatly disconcerted and disturbed by the silence and inaction of the religious authorities. He feared that "it looks as if faith is evaporating," both in society and among the people. "Everywhere the priests are sleeping." "After a generation, at the most after two, our Orthodoxy will dry up." He failed to understand why others did not share his anxiety and agitation. "A whole society of apologists should be established to write and write and write." He had no faith in the effectiveness of official missions or even missionary societies, and dreamed of a genuine apostolic "going to the people." "The firebrands must themselves be on fire, and go everywhere, burning, inflaming the heart through true discourse." He particularly insisted on reexamining and even

reworking the liturgical books, frequently speaking critically about their incomprehensibility and the errors in the accepted translations. "Some of our services are utterly impenetrable."

> Our hierarchy does not find this mindlessness boring because they do not hear it, sitting at the altar. . . because they do not know what obscurity is found in these books, and for no other reason than for the fact that the translation has been outmoded for over a century.

A new, complete, "simplified and clarified" translation of the entire cycle of services would be best of all, and work should begin immediately. He felt that the 1887 celebration of the nine hundredth anniversary of the baptism of Rus would be a suitable and sufficient pretext. "A new translation of the service books is a necessity that cannot be put off." However, nothing was done. The Synod, of course, had no time to think of the matter–it was too busy. Meanwhile, sectarianism was growing precisely because the texts of the liturgy remained uncorrected. Feofan also went further.

> The service books should be amended, in accordance with their purpose. . . . After all, among the Greeks there is a constant revision of the liturgical books. . . . I compared the Octoechos. . . the Greeks have very, very much that is new.

Such creative freedom finds constant expression in various pieces of Feofan's advice. "You want real monasticism? But where will you find it? It is concealed and invisible–what can be seen is merely every sort of indulgence. From time to time the thought recurs that it would be better if no monks could be seen and life was carried on in seclusion, strictly following the example of the ancient monks." After all, starets Paisii had found no "real guide." It would be better to live as two or three in common council and look for guidance in books, the Word of God, and the Holy Fathers. Only one thing is important: acquiring the spiritual life. "God and the soul, alone–there is the monk." "His cell is a window onto heaven." "When there is a monastery in the heart, it is unimportant if the monastery building exists or not." What is important is that one stand consciously before God, "standing mentally before God in the heart." This is a prayer even without words. "Even if you never take a prayerbook in your hands. . . your prayer from the heart will make the prayer that is read superfluous." There is

no need for the words of others when you have your own. In the 1870s Feofan had a difference of opinion with Fr. Ioann of Kronshtadt about the Jesus prayer and about invoking the name of Jesus.[161] Feofan wrote a special book on the subject, although it remained unpublished.

Feofan's religious ideal is least of all what might be described as culturally conditioned. And his design cannot be discerned in applied comments on the "relative responsibilities" of Christians of various stations. His is above all the ideal of the spiritual life. The soul standing in contrition before God, in repentance or prayer, is always his theme. "The Savior is then all hope, and hence the ceaseless 'Lord have mercy.' " The Christian ascends to God through repentance, and lives in him, and "in wonderment immerses himself in his ineffable infinity, and abides in the divine order," reverentially revering and contemplating this divine order of being and life. Feofan combined patristic asceticism with romantic psychology and *Naturphilosophie.* He attended for a time Feofan Avsenev's lectures while a student at the Kiev Academy, and in his "solitude" he did not forget the ones on psychology (based on Schubert's *Geschichte der Seele*).[162] In one of his letters, directly referring to Avsenev and Schubert, Feofan develops a very curious idea about the universal animation of the world, about the "ladder of immaterial forces" in nature, i.e., the forces that "construct things" within the limits of the providential order. "Everything has its immaterial force, which shapes it and sustains it as it was fixed in creation." These forces are of a "spiritual character"–a certain "capacity for instinct" that inheres in things. These forces combine to form the "soul of the world." This is their common substratum. The world soul is the sole object of direct divine influence; God does not directly influence individual things and "forces." "The idea of all created beings" was poured into the world soul at its creation, and it–the world soul– "instinctively" realized them at the appropriate times, or "manufactured them" "at God's sign and stimulation." Nature has a certain responsive and creative power. "When God said: 'Let the earth put forth vegetation,' the world soul heard him and fulfilled the command."

The world is twofold in its composition: "soul" and "element," i.e., matter. The world soul "manufactures" individual things from this "element." "In this soul there is an instinctively sensed image of that which has to be made from the element." There are gradations of the soul: "a sort of chemical soul," then a higher–vegetable, and finally an animal soul. All these souls, these descents of the soul, are in turn "immersed in the soul of the world," dissolved into its

primary substratum. "But man's soul cannot be immersed there; instead the spirit draws it upward at death." Spirit divides man from nature, and consciousness and freedom are given to man in the spirit.

> When it came to creating man, the earth was not given the command: "Let it be put forth." Rather, within the mystery of the Holy Trinity were uttered the words: "Let us create." When God created man, he first formed the body from the earth. What sort of body was it? A living body, an animal in human shape, with the soul of an animal. Then God breathed his own spirit into him, and from an animal man became an angel in human form.

The twofold human compound–natural and spiritual–predetermined the task of human life: spirit must master nature.

Feofan notes the similarity of his theory with Leibniz' doctrine of monads. For him this romantic theory explained the phenomena of hypnotism and clairvoyance, which so consumed his interest. "The fall and redemption are easily reconciled with it." However, Feofan stresses that he is only making a guess. We know less about the material world than about the spiritual, and we shall always remain "on the surface," for we have no need to know more or go deeper. "Mastery of the elements and forces that act in the world will expand; yet this is not knowledge, but merely the ability to make use of that which is revealed of its own accord. Some matters are forever concealed from us." However, a spiritual and penetrating reason may fathom the "hidden idea" fixed in each thing as its "life-creating essence." Such knowledge is only accessible to the man filled with grace, for that realm "is properly the realm of divine intellect, wherein lies the intellectual treasury of the God-King." One cannot hope to storm that realm by force or self-will.

Feofan constructed no system, neither dogmatic nor morally edificatory. He only wished to outline the contours of the Christian life and point the way along the spiritual path, and in this lies his incomparable historical significance. He continued and completed starets Paisii's spiritual exploit by bringing the Russian *Philokalia* to realization and by constructing his living worldview in a fully patristic style and spirit.

From that time onward the tragic schism in Russian ecclesiastical society, the divergence of "ascetical" and "simplified" Orthodoxy, spiritual askesis and moralism, became sharper and sharper. In this connection one must mention Fr. Ioann Sergiev (1829-1908), whose

significance for Russian theology has still not been fully discerned. Fr. Ioann of Kronshtadt is habitually seen as a mere practical pastor, philanthropist, and man of prayer. Rarely does anyone read his remarkable diary *My Life in Christ* as a theological work. Of course, it contains no theological system, but there is a theological experience and a witness to that experience. This is the diary of a contemplative, not a moralizer. The prayer is neither lyrical, nor simply the soaring of the soul, but precisely the soul's encounter with God, the winnowing of the Spirit, a spiritual reality.[163] With boldness and authority Fr. Ioann testifies to the mystery of the Church as a single body and how it actually lives in the Holy Eucharist. "We are one body of love. . . All are of one compact substance. We, you say, are one." Fr. Ioann might be compared with the leaders of the contemporary "liturgical movement" in the West.[164] The eucharist is affirmed anew as the fulcrum of Christian existence. The mysterious or sacramental acceptance of the Church, which during the nineteenth century had become so weakened, particularly by moralistic infirmities, is revitalized and restored, thereby once again laying the foundation for theocentric theology, for surmounting the temptation of theological humanism. "Everything is God's–nothing is ours." The "forgotten paths of experiential knowledge of God" are revealed in Fr. Ioann, and in this spiritual and eucharistic "experience" all theological "psychologism" is overcome. The spiritual life and the experience of the sacraments constitute the sole reliable path to dogmatic realism. This is a return to the spirit of the Holy Fathers.[165] And the return was not just one of historical sympathy or imitation–it was a renewal or rebirth of the very spirit of the Holy Fathers. "The Church is eternal truth."

However, a struggle with a refurbished moralism was still imminent.

IX

LEV TOLSTOI–EDUCATED SECTARIAN

The 1870s witnessed a sharp religious-moralistic awakening at all levels of society. The "going to the people" movement was one of its outbreaks. Moreover, since the 1860s the sectarian movement had

been growing stronger and stronger among the people. Two motifs converged. First, there was a "search for truth," an anxiety about untruth in social and personal life, which was frequently combined with an apocalyptical uneasiness, fear, or hope—fear before the Antichrist or hopeful anticipation of the Second Coming.[166] Second, there was a thirst for "conversion" or "awakening," a decisive turning point in life or a thrust toward something better. This was a new wave of pietism, now spilling over into new social strata. Stundism developed significantly in South Russia, under the direct stimulation of similar movements in the German colonies, where, after all, it was precisely sectarians who were the settlers (among them the "Awakeners" from Bavaria and Würtemburg in the 1820s).[167] It is interesting that Jung-Stilling's *Victorious History* circulated widely among the Molokans.[168]

This moral sensitivity, the heightened impressionability of the conscience, characterizes all the sects of the period. It was the residue of sentimentalism, a new paroxysm of the oversimplified spiritual utopianism that by good feelings and counsel resolves too one-dimensionally the tragic clashes and contradictions of life. A similar movement is observable in the higher social circles. Such, above all, was the "high society schism" provoked during the 1870s in St. Petersburg by the sermons of Lord G.V. Redstock.[169] His was the typical sermon on "conversion" or "revival," the "awakening" of the heart, "justification by faith," the stimulation of good Christian feelings. Apparently Redstock gave most of his sympathies to the Plymouth Brethren.[170] He greatly valued Guyon and Jung-Stilling, and had apocalyptical premonitions. An interesting comment about him was made by Countess A.A. Tolstoi. She wrote with great sympathy about him to Lev Tolstoi that he is "the gentlest, kindest sectarian."[171] But his weak side quickly became apparent. "He knew nothing at all about human nature, and paid not the slightest attention to it, for according to his system each person can in a single moment shed his passions and base inclinations simply by desiring to come to the Lord." "He was a complete unbeliever. I spoke with him in the garden, we prayed together, and he went away a Christian." These last are Redstock's own words.

In 1876 Redstock's followers in Russia founded the Society for the Promotion of Religious and Moral Reading. The chief members were Vasilii A. Pashkov, Baron Modest M. Korf, Count A. A. Bobrinskoi, Princess M. M. Dondukova-Korsakova, Fedor G. Terner, and sometimes Nikolai S. Leskov.[172] In their style the new group approximated the former Bible societies, but with something added from the "going to the people" movement. A philanthropical element

was also vividly expressed (for example, in the visitation of prisons and the reading of Holy Scripture to the prisoners). It was no accident that various pamphlets originally written in Russian or translated into Russian during the time of Alexander I were now reissued for distribution. At first the new preachers did not openly differentiate themselves from the Church. But sectarian exclusivity soon began to grow, and contacts with other sects started (with the Dukhobors, the Baptists, etc.). Then the authorities stepped in, and the "Pashkovite" prayer meetings were suppressed, with the chief leaders being forced to leave Russia in 1884.

In such historical circumstances the religious crisis and "conversion" of Lev Tolstoi (1828-1910) at the end of the 1870s ceases to appear as an individual and isolated episode, and his psychological influence becomes comprehensible. In his *Confession* Tolstoi recounts his life in terms typical of the "conversion" scheme, although his was not an instantaneous one.[173] He was depraved and vile, but behold, he recovered his sight, saw his error, and understood. The essay is a commentary, not a story. His entire life is usually presented in terms of such a decisive revolution. From a "pagan" he becomes a "Christian"; from an artist he is transformed into a preacher and moralist. This conventional scheme is highly imprecise. The *Confession* is, above all, an artistic work, not a naive admission, and was written in a style long characteristic for Tolstoi, beginning with his youthful diaries, his "Franklin journals," the "journal of weaknesses."[174] Of course, he experienced a very significant shock at the end of the 1870s–his "religious crisis." It was not, however, the first "crisis" in Tolstoi's life, and this stormy spiritual shock did not mark any change in his worldview. It was an upheaval within a closed psychological sphere. The experience was tormenting, but it did not shatter the sphere.

Two elements combined to produce Tolstoi's crisis. First, there was a certain perplexity.

> Moments of doubt began to come upon me, moments when life seemed to stop, as if I did not know how I could go on living or what I was to do, and I became lost and fell into despair. These moments of perplexity began to reoccur more and more often, always in the same form. In the moments when life seemed to stop the same questions were always posed: Why? Well, and then?

This was an acute attack of reflection, an exhausting self-interrogation about the meaning of life, about the meaning of individual actions.

The answer was always the same. "The truth was that life is meaningless." The second element was more profound. It was a pull toward death—a tug, an attraction, a fatal and captivating power.

> I did not necessarily wish to kill myself. The power drawing me away from life was stronger, more complete, and more general than a desire. It was a power similar to the earlier aspiration for life, only in the opposite direction. With all my might I struggled against life. I myself did not know what I wanted. I feared life, fought against it, but at the same time I hoped for something from it, and, being afraid of death, I had to use every trick against myself in order not to deprive myself of life.

What is so characteristic here is the dual mental instability of fear, of metaphysical despair. "I cannot see the days and nights that are guiding and driving me towards death. I see death alone, for it alone is true. All else is a lie. The only truth is death." This was fear before an ultimate disappearance or annihilation. "Is there any meaning in my life that will not be destroyed by my inescapable and approaching death?" This made life itself impossible. What for? "Death will come and destroy everything." This was the horror of non-being, fear of being abandoned or forsaken in the world. "It was the feeling of fear of being orphaned, being left alone in an utterly foreign world—and of hope for some kind of help."

The crisis was resolved when a new feeling for life was born, when the conviction that man is not alone in the world returned. "Strangely, the life force that returned to me was not a new one, but the old one, the same that had captivated me in the earliest days of my life." This last admission is especially important. Tolstoi himself acknowledges and testifies to the fact that nothing new was born, that he himself remained unchanged. There was no encounter, mystical experience, revelation, or rapture. It simply became clear that "to know God and to live are one and the same thing. God is life. Live seeking God, and then there will be no life without God." This is the limit of the "fiercest immanence," without any hope, any break whatsoever; everything is complete.

Tolstoi's experience contains one decisive contradiction. He undoubtedly had the temperament of a preacher or moralist, but he utterly lacked religious experience. Tolstoi was completely irreligious—he was religiously ungifted. Dmitrii Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, in his day, noted this point quite boldly.[175] In Tolstoi's doctrine he saw only

the surrogate of religion, suitable only "for educated sectarians." Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii made his judgment as an irreligious humanist, but his observation is accurate. "His doctrine is dry, rational, rationalistic. It is not a religion of the Spirit, but of the syllogism." Tolstoi taught a special brand of moral positivism that somewhat recalls the Stoics. He genuinely valued both Epictetus and Seneca. "This is the alphabet of Christian truth." When, following his "crisis," Tolstoi continued to seek faith, he did not in reality seek as much as try out the beliefs of others, proceeding from his own long-standing and unchanging presuppositions.

In no way did Tolstoi draw his "Christian" worldview from the Gospels. He collated the Gospels with his own views, which is why he found it so easy to reduce and adapt them. For him the Gospels are a book composed many centuries ago "by ill-educated and superstitious men," and it is impossible to accept them in their entirety. He did not have scientific criticism in mind, but simply a personal selection or choice. In one of his last essays he offers a highly characteristic method. With pencil in hand, let each person read the Gospels and mark that which he can understand, using red for the words of Christ and blue for other passages. Only that which is marked, "that which is completely simple and understandable," is essential in the Gospels. And through the power of the unity of reason all of the passages in such a selection must roughly coincide. "One must first of all *believe in reason*, and then select, from among all scriptures–Jewish, Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, Chinese, and modern secular ones–all that *agrees with reason*, throwing out everything that does not agree with it." The naive trust in common sense expressed here is surprising. "There can be error in everything except reason. Men can remain separated only when they believe in various human traditions instead of in reason, which, coming directly from God, is one and the same for all."

Tolstoi undoubtedly sought the spiritual life, but his unrestrained rationalism immediately disfigured that which he undertook. He was able to divine a "beautiful book" in Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain's *Unseen Warfare*, but he measured it by the obligatory standard of "understandability" and decided that it was necessary to "eliminate that which was superfluous and untrue." Tolstoi read the lives of the saints and the works of the fathers and ascetics. But once again he chose and selected, omitting dogmas and miracles. His is precisely a system of reworked Christianity. There is a characteristic passage in his diary for 1862: "I believe in a singular, unattainable, and good God, in the immortality of the soul, and in eternal rewards for our deeds. I do not understand the mystery of the Trinity and the birth

of the Son of God, but I respect and do not reject the faith of my fathers." Tolstoi later corrupted the "faith of the fathers" precisely by this "non-understanding," which was his basic and most repeated line of reasoning.

His basic religious design, interestingly enough, gained definition long before the "crisis." There is a very important entry in the diary under March 5, 1855:

> Conversation about the divine and faith has led me to a great, colossal idea, for the realization of which I feel myself capable of dedicating my whole life. This idea–the foundation of a new religion–is commensurate with the development of mankind, a religion of Christ, but one purified of faith and mystery, a practical religion, one not promising future bliss but conferring bliss on earth. I understand that bringing this idea to fulfillment can only be accomplished by generations consciously working towards this goal. One generation will bequeath the idea to the next, and some day either fanaticism or reason will bring it to fulfillment. To act consciously for the union of men of religion is the foundation of the idea that captivates me.

It remains unclear what impression prompted the recording of this entry. The idea bears a certain similarity to French utopian socialism, which, however, Tolstoi hardly ever studied. A remark in the diary for 1860 (on the occasion of his brother's death) is still more unexpected: "The idea occurred to me to write a materialist gospel, a life of Christ the materialist." In any event, the religious theme attracted Tolstoi long before his final "conversion." His spiritual life wholly developed within changing semi-closed spheres set off from one another by "revolutions" or "interruptions of life."

Tolstoi was a highly personal, "egocentric" writer. Apparently he proceeded to literature from the diary, and his first literary effort, *Childhood* [*Detstvo, 1852*], has an autobiographical character. His "diaries of a youth" are themselves a literary work. "Tolstoi made the passage to literature directly through the diary, and vice versa. Therefore, the diary must be viewed as not merely the usual notebook of entries, but as a collection of literary exercises and raw materials." (Eikhenbaum)[176] This is a very important source for understanding Tolstoi.

In the diaries he wrote as a young man one detects not simply the influence, but the very spirit of the eighteenth century, the spirit of the Enlightenment and sentimentalism. It was as if some contempo-

rary of Zhukovskii or even Karamzin himself had written them. In some strange way, Tolstoi spiritually lagged behind in the eighteenth century, and therefore seems to stand outside of history and contemporary life. He consciously left the present for an invented past. In this connection all of his creative work is an unrelieved moralistic Robinson Crusoe sonata. Pavel Annenkov had earlier dubbed Tolstoi a man with a sectarian mind.[177] "He tried to clarify within himself all phenomena of life and all questions of conscience without knowing or wanting to know any esthetical or philosophical explanations, without admitting any traditions, historical or theoretical, on the grounds that they were deliberately invented by men in order to deceive themselves and others." An insensitivity to history characterizes Tolstoi, and therefore he approached a negation of culture as a historical formation and sequence, as something made coherent by sequential experience. Sequentiality for him is enigmatic. As one recent investigator noted, "The full meaning of his position and system lay in surmounting the onslaught of history." Tolstoi struggled "with history as such, with the very fact of the historical process." He had "no wish to agree with it or allow it any possibility." He protested against the very existence of history. To that extent he was a follower of nihilism, but his is a very peculiar "nihilism," a nihilism of common sense: "common sense" versus "history" (Eikhenbaum).

Tolstoi's sympathies lay entirely in the eighteenth century, above all with Rousseau, Sterne, Bernadin de St. Pierre, and even with *The Vicar of Wakefield.*[178] (It is interesting that Tolstoi later suggested to an "intermediary" that *The Vicar of Wakefield* be republished for the people.) After these writers come Stendahl, Xavier de Maistre, Rodolphe Toepffer (who wrote in the style of Sterne), and finally Proudhon.[179] Tolstoi said of Rousseau: "Rousseau was my teacher from the age of fifteen." As a young man he wore a medallion with a portrait of Rousseau on it on his breast in place of a cross. Tolstoi was aptly known as "un Emil réalisé."[180] In his younger days he wrote literary and psychological exercises in sentimentalism, imitations of Sterne, and letters in the style of Mlle Genlis.[181] Among Russian writers he was attracted most to Karamzin, followed by Novikov and Radishchev.[182] By the 1850s he had read Karamzin, as well as such morally edifying journals of the previous century as *Morning Light* [*Utrennyi svet*].[183] Most characteristic is the remark in his diary for 1853 that "it would not be a bad practice to include a moral in every literary work, as is done in fables." The diaries of the young Tolstoi give very sharp expression to his need for and inclination towards moral regulation—a peculiar form of moral casuistics.

a ceaseless self-analysis and dissatisfaction with himself, and the elaboration of plans and schedules. The stylization of his inadequacies later found in the *Confession* is already present.

It may be said that the *Confession* was written in the moralistic style of the eighteenth century and was entirely developed within the categories of sentimentalism. In Tolstoi's creative work sentimentalism once again erupted towards the upper historical layers of Russian culture. Yet sentimentalism is merely a secularized pietism, a variation of the same psychological type. Tolstoi's religio-moralistic influence and popularity testify to the great power this pietist temptation held over the Russian soul, a power that had not been entirely exhausted and outlived in his day. It is no accident that Tolstoi studied the Alexandrian era—in many ways he felt at one with it. And if he stylized the Pierre of *War and Peace* as his contemporary, then did he not have an even greater wish to portray himself in that contemporary age as the pietist and moralist of bygone days? It is interesting that Tolstoi loved to read Fénelon, and in his time read Angelus Silesius.[184] Tolstoi's affinity with Kant exists within the limits of that same eighteenth century. The affinity lies in the fact that Kant also stood outside the boundaries of his age. Influence is less at issue here than is the immediate identity of design: "a religion within the limits of reason alone" ("innerhalb des bloszen Vernunft"), with the deadest "regulation" and rule of law, excluding anything "mysterious" or "miraculous." In Tolstoi the good itself disappears beneath the category of the law. "Do not do the good, do the lawful. This alone is satisfying, this alone is necessary, important, joyous." For Tolstoi God is not so much the Father as the Master [*Khoziain*], and man is his laborer. This is a step backward, a return from sonship to slavery.

Tolstoi's power lies in his accusatory frankness, in his moral anxiety. A summons to repentance, a tocsin of the conscience, could be heard in him. Yet his limitations and weaknesses are thereby felt more acutely. Tolstoi could not explain the origin of the impurity and falseness of life; he did not notice adequately the radicalness of empirical evil. He naively attempted to reduce everything to incomprehension or irrationality, and to explain everything by "stupidity," "deception," or "evil intention" and "conscious lies." These are wholly characteristic traits of the Enlightenment. Tolstoi knew about man's baseness, and speaks of it with aversion and loathing (note the *Kreutzer Sonata,* 1890). Nevertheless he had no sense of sin. Shame is still not repentance. There is a striking discrepancy between Tolstoi's aggressively maximalist socio-ethical polemic and negation and the extreme poverty of his positive moral teachings. For him all morality

leads to common sense and worldly prudence. "Christ teaches us precisely how we are to be delivered from our unhappiness and how to live happily." All the Gospels point in that direction! At this point his insensitivity becomes painful, and "common sense" is mindlessly turned around. His fundamental contradiction lies in the fact that for him the falsity of life, strictly speaking, can only be overcome by renouncing history, by escaping from culture, and by simplification, i.e., by removing questions and renouncing tasks. In Tolstoi historical nihilism turns moralism around. And in this is the psychological root of his religious apostasy, his falling away from the Church.

Tolstoi left history more than once. The first time came at the end of the 1850s, when he confined himself to Iasnaia Poliana and devoted himself to pedagogical experiments. This was an escape from culture. Least of all did he give any thought at that time to influencing the people. On the contrary, one had to learn the will of the people and fulfill it. In the "opposition of the people to our education" he could see only a just verdict on this useless culture. After all, the *muzhik* has no real need for technology, abstract literature, or even printing. Tolstoi's populism [*narodnichestvo*] acquires an almost pogrom-like texture. Somewhat later he became convinced that philosophy and any science were merely useless, empty words, from which he sought to conceal himself in the working life of the simple people. In the essay "Who Should Teach Whom to Write: We the Peasant Children or the Peasant Children Us?" (1862) Tolstoi, in essentials, had already foreshadowed his future pamphlet on art.[185] *War and Peace* contains the same conception. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii quite aptly labeled this genre as "nihilistic epos." For Tolstoi, Great History is merely a game, which has no heroes and no actors, only invisible fate and a succession of impersonal events. Everything is asleep. Everything crumbles and breaks up into a series of scenes and situations. This is more a mask of life. Nothing is achieved in history. One must conceal oneself from it.

Tolstoi's religious crisis marked the final stage in his nihilistic struggle. He rejected the Church, for he rejected man. He wished to remain alone with common sense. Pride and self-destruction undergo a strange fusion in this nihilism of common sense. Even such an observer as Maksim Gorkii was able to discern and distinguish an "infinite, unmitigated despair and desolation" in this "cunning nihilism."[186] Tolstoi's followers exhibited the same need to leave history and settle in a pious utopia on the nether side of history. Such is the whole object of the Tolstoian "colonies."[187] This was an attack of a peculiar asceticism, a flight from the sinful world, but at the same time an aspiration

to create a new world. The sharp aftertaste of apocalypticism in this movement is obvious. The movement failed; its "cultural sketes," dying from inner weakness, very quickly became empty. But it is no accident that for many, in terms of their personal fate, "Tolstoism" proved to be a path of return to the Church (one need only mention Mikhail A. Novoselov and, later, Prince Dmitrii A. Khilkov).[188] The Orthodox Working Brotherhood of the Elevation of the Cross, founded by Nikolai N. Nepliuev on his Chernigov estate, should be mentioned here.[189]

As a current and as a symptom Tolstoi's influence is characteristic. "The system of reworked gospels has little wisdom–like many other errors it is easily refuted. But these errors will continue to be alluring and infectious so long as the truth, so long as Orthodoxy, exists only in books and sermons, or is realized only in rustic backwaters and in the hermitages at Valaamo or Mount Athos."[190]

X

PROHIBITION OF QUESTIONING

The political turnabout at the outset of the 1880s was quickly expressed in church affairs. The chief ideologue and inspirer of the new "retreat to the past," the new reactionary in politics, the "chief retrograde," was Konstantin Pobedonostsev (1827-1907), who was appointed Over-procurator of the Holy Synod shortly before the assassination of Alexander II.[191] His name is a symbol of the age. There is something impenetrable and enigmatic in his spiritual make-up–"only the shadow of enormous wings," as Blok quite aptly said of him.[192] Pobedonostsev was very circumspect in his words and deeds, and his real voice was hard to discern in his "parchment-like speeches." He always spoke as if he were speaking for someone else, concealing himself in the prosaic harmony and beauty of words measured with great precision. He made a habit of publishing his books and pamphlets anonymously, as if by publishing or composing them he was conveying or elaborating the opinions and ideas of others. This conventional pseudonymity is highly characteristic, for he was the enemy of individual creativity.

By temperament Pobedonostsev was a populist [*narodnik*] or *pochvennik*, which brought him into contact with Dostoevskii.[193]

"I set aside an hour for him on Saturdays after vigil; he would often come to visit me, and we would talk long past midnight." Dostoevskii's inspiration, however, was spiritually foreign to Pobedonostsev. The image of the prophet was quickly eclipsed in his chilly memory. Pobedonostsev was a populist not in the romantic or Slavophile style, but rather in that of Edmund Burke, and without any metaphysical perspectives.[194] His criticism of western civilization contains a great deal that evokes the counterrevolutionary apostrophes of Burke. He believed in the stability of patriarchal life and the native wisdom of the popular element. Personal initiative he mistrusted. Believing in the simple people, in the power of their simplicity and primitiveness, he had no wish to corrupt their innocent wholeness of feeling by grafting on a poisonous, rationalistic western civilization. "The people feel with their souls." Feeling finds its incarnation in traditions and rituals, and Pobedonostsev did not want that feeling to come in contact with the doubt one experiences in thought. Thought, as he presents it, always doubts and destroys—it never creates. It is better to keep silent, and even to preserve superstitions, for in them is the primitive energy of life. With complete satisfaction, Pobedonostsev rejoiced that "an altar to the Unknown God is being erected unknowingly in all these uneducated minds." He loved to dissolve himself in the mass of the people, "to lose myself in the crowd of praying people." He was not in the slightest disturbed by the fact that a great many in the praying crowd could not consciously follow the words of the services. "The people most assuredly understand nothing in the words of the church services, not even the Lord's Prayer—which is often recited with omissions or additions that deprive the prayer of any meaning." Truth is in fact attained not by reason, but by a faith that "transcends all theoretical formulas and rational deductions." "The most valuable ideas," insisted Pobedonostsev, "are in the depths of the will, in twilight."

There is something from positivism in the irreconcilable way Pobedonostsev spurned every form of reasoning; he always opposed "facts" to the conclusions of the mind. Not without irony did he avoid generalization and fear abstract ideas. Thought kills and freezes life. His textbook *Course on Civil Law* [*Kurs grazhdanskago prava*, 1868-1880], which has quite aptly been termed a ten-volume "surveying course," contains practically no "general section." Pobedonostsev recoiled from and "feared the introduction of thought into the construction of institutions." Therein lies the basic ambiguity of his views. His entire defense of the immediacy of feeling is constructed from its opposite. Least of all was he an ingenuous or naive man; least

of all did he himself live by instinct. He was an abstraction through and through, a man of a critical and arrogant mind–"nihilistic by nature," in Sergei Witte's description of him.[195] Pobedonostsev was a disillusioned skeptic. He felt within himself the total coldness of abstract thought, and in the simplicity of the people he sought an antidote for it. He tried to find refuge in custom, returning to the "soil" in order to overcome his own lack of traditional life.

When speaking of faith, he invariably meant the faith of the people, not that of the Church–the "simple faith," i.e., a sense or feeling, an instinct, the celebrated "coalminer's faith," not the dogmas or doctrines of faith. In his view, the Church itself was above all a "living, nationwide institution." He saw no value in that by which Orthodox tradition actually lives and grows, in the daring quality of ascetic exploit, but only in its habits and customary forms. Pobedonostsev was convinced that faith is neither strong nor made stronger because of rational thought, and, moreover, that faith cannot withstand the ordeal of thought and contemplation. He treasured that which is time-honored and rooted in tradition more than he valued the truth. "An old institution is valuable, and hence irreplaceable, because it has not been invented, but was created by life." This organic authority obviously cannot possibly be replaced by anything else, "for its roots are in that part of being where moral bonds are more powerfully and more deeply maintained, i.e., in the unconscious part of being." This should be compared with Burke's theory of "prescription"–"prejudice and prescription."[196] Following this train of thought, myth holds greater promise than does clear understanding, for myth has the power of life, while understanding is impotent. Uncontrolled feeling is more truthful and hopeful than inquisitive reasoning.

Pobedonostsev decidedly disliked and feared theology, and always spoke of the "search for truth" with a cruel and spiteful sneer. He had no understanding of the spiritual life and feared its horizons–hence the duality of his church policies. What he valued most was a village clergy composed of uneducated pastors of innocent flocks. He disliked genuine leaders, fearing their daring and freedom. He feared and refused to acknowledge the prophetic spirit. It was not just a Vladimir Solov'ev or a Tolstoi who confused him–still more troubling were such ascetics and teachers of spiritual construction as Feofan the Recluse and Ioann of Kronshtadt. Pobedonostsev rigorously supervised the selection of bishops not only for political reasons or for the sake of preserving the sovereignty of the state, but also because he wanted to prevent the clergy from exercising any social or cultural

influence. The potential influence of the clergy conflicted with his own personal religious experience and ideal.

Pobedonostsev's services remained after he was gone: the parish schools he founded, the elegant village churches he constructed, the pious manuals and popular prayerbooks he published, his concern for singing in the churches, the material assistance he extended to the clergy, and his bolstering of the philanthropic work of the Church. He understood and appreciated Sergei A. Rachinskii and his "village school."[197] Yet he also shared a basic error with Rachinskii. The "village school" had to be the final one, and pupils should not be encouraged in the unsettling and useless desire to go farther or seek something higher or different, thereby shaking the foundations of the social order. Pobedonostsev assigned a conservative institutional role to the popular schools, in order "to keep the people strictly subordinated to the order of society." The schools must not provide for "general development" as much as inculcate habits and skills strictly corresponding to the immediate environment. In other words, they must be class and semi-professional schools. Pobedonostsev had no desire to exceed these modest beginnings of an applied semi-education, whose purpose was to "protect the holy ancestral testament." There is nothing more. He wanted no religious awakening among the people; he desired no creative renewal in the Church. He was afraid that religious education would lead to Protestantism, and, as N.P. Giliarov-Platonov noted, "fear of Protestantism and freethinking led to obscurantism." Pobedonostsev believed in the conservative stability of patriarchal foundations, but he had no faith in the creative power of the truth and justice of Christ. Every form of action, every movement, he feared. To him conservative inaction seemed more promising than any spiritual exploit. He did not want a growing complexity in life. "That which is simple is alone right."

In the pathos of non-construction in history Pobedonostsev unexpectedly encounters Lev Tolstoi. For all their differences in historical mood and temperament, they resemble one another in the very premises upon which they build, much as Rousseau and Burke were ideologically close to each other. Their message is: "Don't." Such is Pobedonostsev's customary answer. A penetrating aphorism about Russia has been ascribed to him: "An icy wilderness, and a wicked man walks therein." Russia was a wilderness for him to such an extent that he could not admit the existence of any good men. He did not believe in people; he did not believe in man. He suffered from "historical despondency," from suspicion and smallness of faith.

He was a frozen man. In 1882 Ivan Aksakov wrote him a very perceptive letter.

> If you had been asked at the time if the ecumenical councils that we now acknowledge as holy should be called, you would have brought forward such fundamental and critical arguments against them that they would not have taken place. . . . One must not pull up the wheat while pulling up tares, and in order to prevent the pulling up of even one stalk of wheat it is better not to pull up the tares. . . . Thus it is in everything. Your soul is sensitive about everything false and impure to the point of illness, and therefore you begin to react negatively to every living thing, seeing an admixture of impurity and falsehood in everything. Yet no single living thing lives in the world otherwise, and one must believe in the power of good, which is awakened only in freedom. . . . When one gives rein to despair, nothing has any flavor.

It is instructive that Pobedonostsev could not perceive the seraphic sanctity of St. Serafim of Sarov. Here he diverges from the most pious "instinct" of the people. His belief arose not from fulness of the heart but from fear; he had more contempt than even indignation towards man.

Vasilii Rozanov rightly called his famous *Moscow Miscellany* [*Moskovskii sbornik*] a sinful book–filled with the sin of despair, unbelief, despondency.[198] Pobedonostsev's paradox lies in the fact that he was not far removed from a distinctive form of Protestantism. He wholeheartedly accepted the Petrine reform, and remained a western man in spite of all his revulsion for contemporary liberal and democratic western civilization. It is characteristic that he translated only western books: Heinrich Thiersch's *The Christian Foundations of Family Life* (1861), Thomas à Kempis (1869), Frederick Le Play (1893).[199] Also characteristic is the selection of authorities cited in his *Moscow Miscellany*: Thomas Carlyle, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Gladstone, and even Herbert Spencer; and among the romantics, Paul Carus, with his book on the soul.[200]

A clever comparison has been made between Pobedonostsev and the Roundheads.[201] They shared the same legalistic spirit and intolerant moralism. Moreover, Pobedonostsev, like the dessicated English Lord Protector, wished to rule over the Church for the sake of the social welfare. He somehow had no feeling whatsoever for

the mystical reality of the Church. In his policies he was a typical Erastian.[202] He lacked ecumenical perspectives. Most characteristic of all in this regard is his experiment in "perfecting" the Russian text of the New Testament on the basis of the "Slavonic original," without reference to the Greek. This effort was a complete failure, even from the standpoint of style. Pobedonostsev's callous intolerance extended not just to the heterodox–he was still more despotic in the "prevailing" Church. He nearly succeeded in creating around himself the painful illusion of an icy calm. Far from everything in the Church was subjected to his energetic regulation, of course, but during his tenure the overriding significance of the over-procurator's power in the "Department of the Orthodox Confession" grew still greater.

Pobedonostsev's stubbornness is often explained by his fear of the approaching revolution, and he is compared with Konstantin Leont'ev. The comparison is very imprecise. In a letter written in the 1880s, Leont'ev unsparingly condemned the "worthless silence" of the frightened conservatives. He clearly saw that limiting the life of the Church to conservatism alone "would mean dooming the Church to nearly complete impotence." Prohibition is not a means for producing conviction.

> We are told that "at the end" only a small number of the elect will remain. Yet we are also told that we shall not know until the very last minute when the end will actually come. Why then should we throw up our hands prematurely and deprive the Church of all the revitalizing reforms, which she possessed in her best days, from the descent of the Holy Spirit to the great victory over the iconoclasts, etc., etc.?

Leont'ev insisted that the time had come for theologizing, especially by laymen. Personal life must be linked to obedience and fully subordinated to the will of a chosen elder, yet the mind must remain free–free, of course, within the limits of dogma and tradition. After all, new questions do arise, and it is entirely appropriate for laymen exploring the road ahead to speak about them. For Pobedonostsev there were no such "new questions" worth resolving. Questioning is dangerous. He chose precisely the "worthless silence" condemned by Leont'ev. Pobedonostsev did not want anyone to think about or discuss the faith. Not only was he a pessimist, he was a skeptic, beguiled not just as regards falsehood, but also as regards Christian truth itself.

Reform of the schools once more headed the list of the new church policies. Dmitrii Tolstoi's reforms of the 1860s had not, in fact, been a complete success.[203] Metropolitan Makarii, who had been sent on an inspection tour in 1874, discovered significant gaps and deficiencies in the life of the academies. In 1881 the Holy Synod established a commission to reexamine the statutes of the schools. It was chaired by Sergii Liapidevskii (a future Metropolitan of Moscow), and included the participation of representatives of the academy and the School Committee.[204] A return to the previous departmental or vocational orientation was proposed, while many favored a simple restoration of the former statute. The fourth year of the academic course, with its excessive specialization, was pronounced a failure. The privatdocent category should be altered, while the best candidates for scholarly work should be "retained at the academy." Curiously enough, instruction in patrology was again declared to be superfluous, and yet it was recognized as desirable to restore instruction in natural-science apologetics. V.D. Kudriavtsev also proposed the introduction of moral philosophy and philosophy of law. An important decision was the change in the public character of academic disputations, in spite of voices favoring publicity. "The subjects of faith will become a means for bandying words," said Archbishop Sergii.

The commission held thirty-two sessions, without the participation of anyone from outside of St. Petersburg, and finished with an incomplete statute. Its draft reached the Synod in March 1883, and a special conference was formed to examine it consisting of three synodal hierarchs: Metropolitan Ioannikii, Leontii (who later became metropolitan), and Archbishop Savva.[205] This committee worked without publicity, but did not bring the matter to a close. The final *Statute* [*Ustav*] was apparently worked up in the chancellery of the over-procurator, in the strictest secrecy, and without any discussion rushed through the Synod. "Metropolitans Isidor and Platon signed without even glancing at the clean copy of the draft. Metropolitan Ionafan, who did not take part in our commission, wished to read it but did not succeed in doing so," relates Archbishop Savva.[206] Savva did not fully concur with the commission and requested the opportunity of presenting his views for the consideration of the Synod–a desire that was not respected. Soon the archbishop was released entirely from the duty of attending the Synod.

On April 20, 1884 the academy statute received confirmation, being slated for implementation as early as the fall of that year. The structure of the academy underwent serious alteration. The authority of the diocesan bishop was strengthened, while the rector was returned

to his administrative position, being allowed to give no more than two lectures per week. Departments were eliminated and only secondary subjects, offered as electives, were kept in groups. The specialization of the fourth-year course was changed. Graduation theses had to be written on theological themes (a rule that, in fact, was not very strictly observed). It was quite characteristic that the doctoral degree was now generally awarded without the defense of a dissertation in a public academic forum, but solely on the basis of comments by reviewers. The practice was introduced of conferring doctoral degrees in separate areas–theology, church history, and canon law. Defense of a master's dissertation was left to a "colloquium" held during sessions of the academic council, amplified through the participation of "outsiders invited by the council." But they were not invited to a public disputation. Open debate, disagreement, or unwanted notoriety had to be avoided, for public rebuttal only draws unnecessary attention to the opponents. Pobedonostsev dreaded focusing attention on religious questions. He feared debates and disagreements, and doubted that the Church was prepared to defend itself. He preferred to protect it from above, through government paternalism and authority. The awakening interest in religion in Russian society rather disturbed him. He valued religion as social custom, not as quest.

However, in the 1870s Pobedonostsev himself somewhat actively participated in the work of the "St. Petersburg branch" of the Society of the Lovers of Spiritual Enlightenment, established earlier in Moscow. The "branch" came into being in 1872, largely in connection with the Old Catholic movement. Its tie with the Moscow group was only nominal. Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich served as the distinguished chairman of the branch. Laymen, mostly from the highest social circles, predominated among its members. Among the participants from the clergy should be mentioned the archpriests Ioann L. Ianyshev, Iosif Vasil'ev, and P.E. Pokrovskii. At its very inception the "branch" received an important honor: permission to freely discuss church affairs "in their own midst," i.e., in closed sessions. The Old Catholic question was the first to be discussed. The branch published its protocols in Russian and French editions, and during the 1870s served as a very important nucleus for theological interests. It broadly exercised its right of "free" discussion, and actually touched on quite complex and delicate problems in its meetings. Moreover, public lectures were arranged. One should note here Tertii Filippov's address on the theme "The Needs of *Edinoverie*"[207] and his debate with I. Nil'skii (in 1873 and 1874); F.G. Terner's theses on freedom of conscience and education (delivered at the beginning of 1876), as well

as his lectures on the Christian and the modern philosophical views of life (1878 and 1879); and Fr. Ioann Ianyshev's lectures on freedom of conscience and "On the Essence of Christianity from the Moral Point of View."[208] These represented the religious-philosophical gatherings of their day. Vladimir Solov'ev was close to this circle at the end of the 1870s, after having moved to St. Petersburg. His famous *Lectures on God-Manhood* should be mentioned here also. In the 1880s, after Pobedonostsev was named over-procurator, such meetings became impossible.

Pobedonostsev likewise had no sympathy for the freedom of theological publication. Under pressure from the ecclesiastical censorship, at the beginning of the 1890s the best theological journals ceased publication. Among them were *Orthodox Review, Proceedings of the Moscow Society of Lovers of Spiritual Enlightenment,* and even the *Supplements to the Works of the Holy Fathers in Russian Translation* of the Moscow Academy.[209] True, new journals were founded: *Faith and Reason,* in 1884 in Khar'kov (on the initiative of Archbishop Amvrosii Kliucharev); the Moscow Academy's *Theological Messenger,* beginning in 1892; and *Faith and the Church,* which began in Moscow in 1899.[210] An obligatory caution, however, can be felt in all of them. Pobedonostsev gave his sympathies to the development of publications designed for the people. A series of popular journals arose, including *Sunday*, published by Fr. S. Uvarov; *The Rudder; Pastoral Interlocutor,* published by Mavritskii; and *The Russian Pilgrim*—a somewhat surprising replacement for *Church-Society Messenger,* under the editorship of A.I. Popovitskii.[211] To these must be added the non-periodical *Trinity Leaflets*, published by Archimandrite Nikon, who subsequently became Bishop of Vologda.[212]

The significance of these publications must not be minimized, and yet theological literature as a genre undoubtedly declined to the level of simple edification. In reality this represented an apostasy of the Church from culture. Contentious questions, in any case, were removed, and the answers were sought outside of the Church, thereby unarguably undermining any influence the Church had. The St. Petersburg Society for the extension of Religious and Moral Enlightenment in the Spirit of the Orthodox Church, founded in 1881 on the initiative of the St. Petersburg archpriests D. Ia. Nikitin and M.I. Sokolov, could only be promoted under the rubric of "edification."[213] The new missionary journals *Fraternal Word,* revived in 1883 under the editorship of N.I. Subbotin; *Orthodox Annunciator,* beginning in 1893; and *Missionary Review* (1896) also deserve mention.[214] Moral themes made the greatest advance. The desire increased to give a

ready answer to every question, to impart the impression that the Orthodox worldview was one of utter finality, and to stifle the possibility of any "perplexing questions." "State paternalism saves us from a genuinely serious struggle for Orthodoxy," Vladimir Solov'ev justly remarked.

Pobedonostsev was bewildered by the growing stream of students entering the ecclesiastical academies–a stream that grew particularly after seminarians were barred from entering the universities. Self-supporting students living in private apartments complicated the supervision and observation of the inspector. A new directive required that such students live only in the academy dormitories (to the extent the "capacity of the buildings" permitted). The huge number of students at the academies seemed superfluous and unsettling–there were more than enough candidates in the seminaries and ecclesiastical schools to fill the vacant positions. Curiously, the desirability of higher theological education as preparation for pastoral service was entirely forgotten, which represented a direct reversion to the principle of service in the theological schools. In 1887 the number of treasury-supported stipends at the academies was reduced, and the number of students quickly fell by almost half.

A very curious document–and one that is particularly revealing of Pobedonostsev's worldview–is the special "Rules for Reviewing Treatises Presented for the Purpose of Obtaining Scholarly Theological Degrees," published in 1889. Everything is presented as something fully decided. Its chief goal was purportedly to prevent or eliminate harmful theological ideas. Attention should be directed not only at the scholarly merits of a work, "but also at the correspondence of its general tendencies with the spirit and dignity of the Orthodox Church." It was demanded "that the works contain such completion and precision of exposition on any given subject or question that no doubts could remain about the truth of Orthodox doctrine; and, moreover, such precise expression that all grounds for false questions would be removed." In pusuit of scholarly degrees studies of heretics or "false doctrines" were forbidden, for to sustain attention for too long on such themes is harmful. Investigating the "unity of ideas" among heresies was especially forbidden (note, for example, Vladimir Solov'ev's attempt in *The Great Debate* to deduce all heresies from a single principle). On the contrary, one had to show the blindness and incoherence among heresies. There can be no consistency in a false principle.

> Such works, even when they seem to have a scholarly basis, cannot be admitted as appropriate to the requirements

> of scholarly theological treatises if they deny the actuality of events that church tradition and popular belief are accustomed to regard as genuine.

This referred, above all, to the famous tale of St. Andrew's visit to Russia–a tale whose complete inauthenticity had been demonstrated by Golubinskii–as well as to Golubinskii's entire critique of the chronicle version of Prince Vladimir's baptism.[215] It was prohibited to "illintentionally place any institutions or regulations of the native Church in a false light"–which meant investigation into the origins of the Schism, the Old Ritual, or the Petrine reform. Explaining ecclesiastical-historical events as the play of only natural causes or as products of human aspirations and efforts that were often base or brought about through the influence of the schools or other general tendencies was likewise forbidden, as was finding traces of nobility among heretics and pagans or blemishes on the characters of pious people, etc. As a result, the second volume of Golubinskii's *History* was denied publication, and its author was even forced to leave the academy. Nikolai Kapterev had to abandon his essays on Patriarch Nikon. Sergei N. Trubetskoi was subjected to a very harsh attack for his dissertation on "Metaphysics in Ancient Greece" (eventually published in 1890), in which he had rather cautiously and guardedly spoken of the "gospel preparations" in Hellenism.

The proposed prophylactic measure, in any event, was quite comprehensive. One had to take account not only of church tradition, but also of popular belief. It could always be said that this or that book lacked a "strictly theological character" or "did not express the doctrine of the Orthodox Church with complete precision," or that such and such a line of reason "by its vagueness and imprecision" might be wrongly understood, especially by uninformed readers. Filaret Gumilevskii in his own day had warned against the ambiguity of such fears. "They fear the cries of the ignorant! You cannot silence them by shouting a falsehood. Truth defends itself, but human constructions are fit only for destruction by time." Pobedonostsev precisely lacked the conviction that "truth defends itself"–to him it always seemed defenseless. The "Rules of 1889" were more an act for preserving state and custom than for guarding the Church; they were the act of the synodal bureaucracy, not the hierarchy.

The complications surrounding Evgenii P. Akvilonov's master's dissertation are particularly revealing here. At the time Akvilonov was a privatdocent at the St. Petersburg Academy, and he later became head chaplain of the armed forces. In 1894 he presented for his mas-

ter's degree a study of the Church entitled "The Church: Scholarly Definitions of the Church and Apostolic Teaching about it as the Body of Christ."[216] Apparently the theme was suggested by Akvilonov's adviser, Katanskii;[217] Akvilonov merely elaborated the ideas of his teacher. In his review of the work Katanskii gave it a high evaluation, noting, among other things, that "the author successfully proves the insolvency of the usual definitions of the Church." This referred to the catechetical definitions of the Church as a "society of men." (The *Orthodox Confession* provides no definition of the Church, and neither is any found in the *Letter of the Eastern Patriarchs.*) Akvilonov demonstrated the inadequacy of this definition, which came from the schools of more recent years. This definition can more accurately be termed a description, and a very incomplete one, for the Church is more than just a society: it is an organism or "body" to whose composition, in addition to the people, belongs Christ himself–the Head of the Church, in whom the Church is one. The "body of Christ"–the image or designation used by the apostles–is the best definition, as is fully confirmed by the testimony of the fathers. Akvilonov succeeded in assembling the most important texts for his book. Among Russian authors he is closest to Filaret (from his sermons) and Khomiakov.

Akvilonov failed, however, to forge a complete definition of the Church. He provided only a prolix paraphrase of the basic designation "body," and in general the book was written in a flaccid language. Yet it could serve as a promising introduction for further research. The first chapter, which too decidedly denigrated the "accepted" definition of the Church as a "society," was confusing. It also seemed contentious when he included angels in the composition of the Church. Some things in the book were in fact left unfinished.

Scholarly degrees were confirmed by the Holy Synod after entrusting one of the diocesan hierarchs to review the dissertation from the standpoint of its usefulness for teaching about the faith. Akvilonov's book was assigned to Vissarion Nechaev, Bishop of Kostroma, who previously had been the long-time editor of the journal *Reading Useful for the Soul.* Vissarion concurred with the academic reviewers' report and expressed the wish that the definition of the Church found in the *Catechism* be corrected. This wish provoked unrest in the Synod. At that moment the *edinovertsy* archimandrite Pavel Prusskii and Professor N.I. Subbotin, Pobedonostsev's trusted correspondent, came forward decisively against Akvilonov's book, speaking on behalf of the "simple believers." Bishop Vissarion stuck to his views, while Pobedonostsev defended the "popular beliefs."

The question was resolved when Metropolitan Sergii of Moscow (with the unexpected support of Bishop Sil'vestr) discovered a most dangerous rationalism in Akvilonov's book, and the author was forced to write a second dissertation.

This episode is characteristic for its warped perspectives. There was more interest in preserving the inviolability of the *Catechism* than fidelity to genuine patristic tradition, while the moods of the champions of the simple people grew in significance and decisiveness. These considerations obviously prompted the inclusion in the "Rules of 1889" of the paragraph requiring that theological books be written so that people who knew no Greek at all could understand them (the rule was directed against citations of the fathers in the original language). Pobedonostsev's repressive policy proved to be doubly fruitless. He did not achieve inner tranquility, but only the illusion of calm, and he achieved that at a high price. The habit of cunning silence was created; people kept disagreeable opinions to themselves. The ecclesiastical schools and theological literature developed an insincere and lifeless style. The basic falsehood of the regime of prohibition is rooted in that insincerity. The system of repression and command merely instilled a spirit of disavowal and hypocrisy in the church schools. Of course, Pobedonostsev certainly did not succeed in removing "liberalism" or "doubt" from the ecclesiastical schools, but he did teach the students and instructors to conceal their real thoughts. And by forcibly restraining the students of the schools of the "department of religion" this insincerity poisoned the priesthood itself. This characterization is, of course, a general one; there were always a sufficient number of exceptions.

In spite of all the prohibitions, "disloyal" theological views spread. After all, the impossibility of public discussion also meant the impossibility of openly refuting them. The censor held back the Moscow professor M.N.Muretov's sparkling book against Renan because for the purposes of refutation he had "expounded" the "false doctrine" being refuted, and this seemed disloyal.[218] Renan continued to be read secretly, while publication of the book directed against him was delayed for fifteen years. The impression arose that such prohibition was prompted by impotence. Moreover, there were too many attempts to defend that which was impossible to defend, which powerfully undermined confidence. The spirit feel when the vocation of teacher was subverted by the duty of being a warden.

All this, however, was of small acount. The entire system was internally orchestrated by a caustic skepticism. Count Protasov had earlier tried to adapt religious education to village needs, yet he had

merely been a "good officer" in the Synod, guided by considerations of state utility. Pobedonostsev was a skeptic and an *intelligent.* For him the goal of village "simplification" meant something different. If he usually spoke of utility or necessity, in reality he was always thinking of the danger of "excessive" education. His approach to the idea of simplification was not even guided by the pathos of state power, but rather by the most poisonous unbelief. He wanted to weaken the "general education" element in the ecclesiastical schools precisely for that reason. What need does a priest have of algebra or geometry? Pobedonostsev wanted to ward off the dangers of education by formal prohibition; he did not plan to conquer or surmount them openly or from within. In this manner he semi-consciously drove vital questions beyond the horizons of the Church, pushed them out among other questions beneath the threshold of consciousness, expelled them by vindictive decree. The following words from one of Vasilii Rozanov's essays in the 1890s are so characteristic of this mistrustful conservative: "The Church cannot permit the truths of faith to be discussed, but not from a fear that they might be shaken. It is because of an aversion for such discussion. . . The apostate from the Church despises it so much that he cannot bear to even look at it."

Evangelical feelings and motifs certainly do not obtrude on the Church here. The Church, it is supposed, should act more like a guardian than a physician or teacher. Such frenzy was taken for and passed off as zeal for the faith. Yet it was doomed to barrenness. Hatred does not give life, only love does. And how often does hatred merely conceal fear and impotence. The image of the good pastor was entirely forgotten—"he leaves the ninety-nine."[219] The toxin of protectionism, however, went deeper still. The religious level was consciously lowered; Orthodoxy itself was "simplified." Pobedonostsev was able to persuade the Russian clergy that "theology" is not essential to Orthodoxy, not Russian Orthodoxy, in any event. In other words, theology is not part of the essence of the "simple" or "popular" faith of Russia, for, after all, the great mass of these "simple people" achieves salvation without any theology and without any form of thinking or culture. "They are saved" in a way that is hardly less reliable than that of a thinking and searching intelligentsia. Faith put forward in this manner was reduced to the level of uncontrolled feelings and pious moods. Dogmas were accepted more in a canonical manner, as protective words, than in a theological manner, as the life-giving truth.

Strictly speaking, this was merely a peculiar application of Lev Tolstoi's typical deductions in a new realm of ecclesiastical culture.

Tolstoi denied that cultural blessings–neither technology nor Shakespeare, nor even bookprinting–have any significance, and precisely on the grounds that they are wholly unnecessary for the village dweller. From this he concluded that all culture is obviously superfluous, an ornament created through man's idleness, for it is unnecessary for life. One can fully live one's whole life without it, but to live in culture is difficult and complex. Virtually the same deductions were now brought to bear in the defense of the "simple faith." After all, the pious old woman, the unlettered muzhik, the devout pilgrim or monk "from among the simple people," all survive entirely without the need of some "learned" theology or philosophy which they neither understand nor wish to, and without which they can live properly and honestly. Is it not correct to conclude that all these theological and philosophical "problematics" are merely the fruit of useless searching and the curiosity of idle and restless minds? They are not needed "for salvation."

The ease with which Pobedonostsev succeeded in casting suspicion on "theological reasoning" stems from the fact that suspicion answered to the decadent and nihilistic mood of the times. Positivism destroyed confidence in superexperiential metaphysics. "Agnosticism" became the typical intellectual pose of the average man, and dogmatic truths were felled by such agnostic abstemiousness. An ascetical agnosticism was now combined with a worldly one. On the pretext of humility and incomprehensibility the attention of believers was deflected from dogma–how can it be comprehended by feeble reason! Yet humility too often simply conceals indifference or even smallness of faith. The incomprehensibility of divine truth is surely exaggerated by these sly designs, calculated to evade dogmatic *akrivia* and unjustly keep the mind in an infantile state. Dogmatic confusion and unsteadiness are inescapably manifested as the inner result of such dual agnosticism, such a temptation of moralism. The heart becomes unaccustomed to living and being nourished by dogmas that are so vainly protected. Dogma turns out to seem somehow spiritually unnecessary. Thus, a new wave of moralism, sentimentalism, and pietism arose in Russia's ecclesiastical consciousness in the 1880s. The excessive attack on rationality and rationalism proved to be not without danger even for the doctrines of the faith themselves. Good feelings and actions were more highly valued, while too much in the doctrines of the faith began to be regarded somehow as useless subtleties. It is better for the soul to remain in the twilight rather than to give any opportunity to the seductions of a restless mind. Faith is construed more as confidence than as the experience of the spiritual life. And to this is added still another very important factor. The clergy remained a

class drawn in large measure from the ranks of the "village dwellers." Too often rural poverty and simplicity remained for them their most common and understandable environment. Hence the peculiar absence of freedom in relation to cultural values: the naive attraction for the trappings of civilization together with an inner lack of the habit of living "in culture," in an environment of creative tension. Not everyone developed a need for culture. There were, of course, many exceptions to this general tendency, but the general style was undoubtedly degraded.

The caste-like character of the clergy still further separated it—and the Church—from culture. Thus, a debased type of simplified and very impotent Orthodox ecclesiastical awareness was formed. This development was, moreover, a highly dangerous anachronism, for it was entirely out of keeping with the times. The intelligentsia was beginning to return to the Church, and religious searching was becoming more and more acute. As Aleksandr A. Kireev wrote so trenchantly in the 1880s, "With trembling and shame we have come to give an account for our blindness, for our negligence, for the fact that we have handed over our faith to the Synod and now sit here with folded arms." This statement was denounced as unrelated to the "people." "Our people did not place their faith in any chancellery or synod." The attempt to skirt this question by relying on prohibitions ended in a tragic rupture. In time the passions and doubts thus pushed aside violently erupted from obscure depths. This was precisely a retribution. In this regard, the words of Tiutchev, spoken on another occasion, are fully applicable here:

> The fatal word lays him waste: Freedom of conscience is a delirium.[220]

XI

THE THEOLOGY OF "MORAL MONISM"

The 1880s were not just a time of social lassitude and depression, or simply an era of "small deeds" and "balanced souls." To contemporaries it might have seemed that "the living hid themselves in graves

while the dead arbitrarily rose from the tombs,"[221] but this is not the whole truth. Half a century later it became clear how much of the later flowering was conceived at that time. Mystical anguish and anxiety had already begun, even if still on an unconscious level, and metaphysical motifs became ever more clearly defined in the growing moral restlessness. Questions of ultimate meaning became ever more acute. This represented a secret and often unhealthy, irresolute, and shaky return to faith: "The harbingers come too early, the spring too late."[222]

Vladimir Solov'ev's religious articles characterize the 1880s. Although they were frequently too biting, entirely unfounded, and spiritually shortsighted, they always conveyed a genuine agitation for the truth. His polemic of that time with the Slavophiles is striking for its intense fervor, its hasty judgments and denunciations, its completely unexpected indelicacy, and the rather odd foreshortening of perspectives. The issues he raises, however, are not thereby diminished in significance. He worked on these themes with an obvious verve and vitality, witnessing to the historical truth, deeds, and power of the Church. Therein lies the apologetical value of his writings, which was not confined only to that era. He demonstrated that it is precisely in Christianity that all the creative possibilities and needs of human life are fused into one living body. This also constitutes the psychological significance of his famous "report" to the Moscow Psychological Society, *On the Collapse of the Medieval Worldview*, delivered in 1891.[223] Here again is that same problematics of Christian conscience–a theme that recurrently arose in the works of that remarkable Moscow society.

We have already discussed N.Ia. Grot's programmatic article in the first issue of *Problems of Philosophy and Psychology* (1889).[224] A new "doctrine of life" needs to be revealed or constructed, as its justification. Does it not seem that Russia's contribution to the revolving process of philosophical searching lies precisely in the posing anew of the moral question? "Does not the historical task of Russian thinkers lie in the synthesis of ideals from the point of view of the higher interests of the good?" And are the moral preoccupations of all Russian literature not a witness to this? "Is the philosophy of the salvation of the world from evil, of its moral perfection, not to be precisely our own, special philosophy? We await 'salvation' from beauty itself, and from truth as well." In such a perspective, is the philosophy of Schopenhauer not a "prophecy and sign of the future"? Grot's conjectures very clearly reflect the mood of that time, all that restless questioning, anxiety of the heart and conscience.

In these psychological circumstances the problem of the pastoral task of the Church arose with a new force.

> The contemporary pastor must fully master the views of this age on all aspects of being and life, he must clearly comprehend their agreement or disagreement with Christian doctrine, and he must be able to evaluate any philosophical idea, even if it is only casually flung out in some fashionable story or article in a journal. He should not lament if he is called on to acquire an in-depth understanding of the systems of Kant or Comte. Believe me, even this is not enough for his further activity. . . . How can the life and studies of theological students be brought closer to the Church? We must arouse in them a religious and theological self-dependence . . . . Instead of berating the professors and students of the academies, instead of an aggravated search for heresies in their writings and finding fault with their conduct, let the zealots for ecclesiasticity show how this condition might be introduced. . . . Young men in the theological schools do not study life! On the contrary, separated from life by their caste, they are even more sealed off from it by seminary education. It stands to reason
>
> that the schools will not produce fighters for life or zealots for truth, but only dry theoreticians and artificially cultivated reasoners. Can such people carry the good news to life, heal shattered hearts, or set the tormented free? (Antonii Khrapovitskii)[225]

These words were spoken somewhat later, in 1896, but they could also have been said at an earlier date. Here pastoral enthusiasm clashed with and diverged from the official and officious lack of any sense of faith. The pastoral awakening, or the renewal of the pastoral ideal, had become quite pronounced by the mid-1880s. It had found its earliest expression in the St. Petersburg Academy, when Arsenii Briantsev, later Archbishop of Khar'kov, replaced Ioann Ianyshev as rector.[226] Antonii Vadkovskii (1846-1912), subsequently Metropolitan of St. Petersburg, was transferred from Kazan to serve as inspector.[227] A man of warm sensibility and disposition, Antonii became the center of the so-called "Host" [*Druzhina*], a circle of zealots for monasticism. After an interruption of twenty years, students once again began to be tonsured. An ascetic ideal grew inwardly together with the pastoral calling, which represented a new trait. Under

these conditions "learned" monasticism outside the monastery walls could be justified.[228]

The first new tonsure at the St. Petersburg Academy occurred in 1884, when Mikhail Gribanovskii (1856-1898), later Bishop of the Crimea, embarked on the monastic path. Nowadays he would be called a "white monk." This applies in particular to his book *Upon the Gospels* [*Nad Evangeliem*], which contains so much spring sunshine.[229] Very much alive and acute is a feeling for *sobornost'*, which does not come from below, from human agreement, but rather descends from above, as a reflection of the Trinity. "From here comes its unconditional authority. The formal conciliar structure of our Church is not self-contained, but rather the Holy Spirit clearly manifests itself in it through his gifts and intimations. *Sobornost'*, as the form and means for manifesting the Holy Spirit, is, after Christ, the highest unconditional authority."

Mikhail's religious acceptance of nature is also characteristic. Faith reveals a new perfection in nature, one not grasped by an outward dispersion of consciousness.

> The earth has passed into base materiality, but the forms of its life, which reflect God's eternal beauty, remain, so that in its renewed blooming the Lord might be still more loudly and harmoniously glorified and our spiritual eyes and hearts sweetened. Nature is the renewed earth into which we shall enter as masters along with Jesus the Victor–we shall enter as ones resurrected and renewed, like the angels of God.

During his seminary years Mikhail passed through a nihilistic crisis ("the gamut of all possible negations"). He returned to faith through philosophy. At the academy he studied under Mikhail Karinskii and wrote his dissertation on Heraclitus, who reminded him of Schelling.[230]

> As Schelling noted, to comprehend Christianity philosophically is the greatest task of our times. There should be no discord. The dogmas of the greatest absolute religion must serve as the greatest and most truthful philosophy. One needs only to understand them and infuse them with a philosophical analysis and synthesis. This is still not Christian philosophy. That must be created. But the yearning for it already exists; mankind thirsts for it, and is dissatisfied with faith alone.

Thus was born the idea that the Church has a philosophical vocation. Mikhail wrote his master's thesis under the characteristic title, "An Experiment in Clarifying the Basic Christian Truths through Natural Human Thought" (1888). Only the first part, *The Truth of Divine Being*, was published.

Antonii Khrapovitskii belonged to the same generation of monks at the St. Petersburg Academy. He came to the theological academy from a secular school, with a temperament formed by religious Slavophilism, influenced by Dostoevskii, and an already firm decision to enter upon the pastoral path. For him philosophical interests were paramount; the goal of uniting faith and philosophy took precedence over all else. He wrote his master's dissertation on the *Psychological Data in Favor of Free Will and Moral Responsibility* (1887). This was the only book he ever wrote. He had the temperament of a journalist, and usually wrote only sketches or essays. As a very young man he was appointed rector of the Moscow Academy. No researcher or scholar, he nevertheless had his own lively ideas, and a special gift for communicating or imparting them. He was nearly the same age as his students, which immediately lent his teaching and other activities a very special intimacy. Antonii had his own fully worked out design and plan about how the Church should act and operate. He testified above all to the Church's pastoral vocation. In his pastoral ideal, one can sense the great influence of the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The pastor is also a prophet or "guide to the conscience." The Church, in its pastoral work, builds the popular conscience. There is but one path: the path of suffering love and spiritual solidarity. "Our theology must make it clear that earthly life is a sea of suffering, bitterness, and tears. There is neither time nor place to be occupied with an inert contemplation of our personal powers or capacities while foresaking ministration to our neighbor on the pretext of our imperfections."

To this day Antonii's lectures and essays on pastoral theology fully retain their untarnished charm of conviction and inspiration. It is easy to understand how attractive his early teaching in the academy was. As a student recorded in his memoirs:

> We lived enflamed by his love and tenderness. For many of us he was probably the first to reveal the meaning of the Orthodox pastorate as a loving and self-sacrificial acceptance of the flock into one's soul, experiencing together with it all of its sorrows and joys, all of the trials, temptations, and failings of one's spiritual children and their spiritu-

> al rebirth and restoration through the power of a compassionate pastoral love and prayer.

For Antonii, the pastorate is above all a way of love, an active and actual love. The very sacrament of the priesthood teaches a certain special grace of love, "the gift of compassionate love." This gift, of course, can be reinforced and revealed only through personal spiritual exploit, through actually acquiring love for the people. But the acquisition of that love is possible only through the grace of spiritual love, through an inner rebirth and expansion of the pastoral heart. This means the pastor's capacity for "spiritual identification" with the flock. His personal "I" must, as it were, disappear, to be replaced always and in everything by "we."

Pastoral influence is founded on the mysterious communion of souls. "The person to whom this influence is directed feels the very spirit of the pastor, as if a certain other is penetrating his heart." The pastor's will acts upon another's freedom, but acts in freedom. Here is a reciprocal communion: action and adoption. The context of the reality of the Church provides the possibility for such a "mysterious communion of souls." Antonii ascends from psychology to ontology. Reciprocal communion is granted to us in experience. "By which laws of the spiritual life does a portion of one being pass into the soul of another and mingle with it?" It might also be asked if human beings are actually so divided from one another.

> To clarify this phenomenon, we must first reject the notion that each personality is a finished, self-contained entity (a microcosm), and see if we can discover a single, common root among all people in which the unity of our nature is preserved and in relation to which each individual soul, although possessing independence and freedom, is a branch. The human "I," in its utter isolation, in its complete opposition to the "not-I" –as it is presented in the courses on psychology–is to a large degree a self-deception. This deception is supported by our self-perception, which grows in the soil of the sinful self-love characteristic of a fallen humanity.

Antonii insists that man's "single nature" is not merely an abstraction, "an abstract conception," but precisely a "real essence." At this point Antonii surrenders himself to an unexpected voluntarism,

reminiscent of Schopenhauer ("the world as will," and an impersonal, dark, and blind will). "The one nature of all men is the impersonal but powerful will that each human personality is compelled to take into account, regardless of where one's personal free will is directed." Antonii's "general-human nature" is ambiguous. "We cannot but notice in ourselves the manifestation of a general-human collective will, which is not of me but in me, and from which I can only partially divorce myself, and then only with difficulty and through struggle." The conscience, above all, is a part of this, as are the darker impulses, carnal desires, etc. Yet exactly how man's personal and responsible will relates to this underground and impersonal will is not clearly or easily understood. In any event, the unity of nature is now broken and disfigured. It is restored only in the Church, and restored the more fully, and "in the future life this unity will be expressed still more potently than the multiplicity of human personalities."

The high-priestly prayer of the Savior (John 17) directly testifies to "the unification of all those who are saved in the coming age, not in the sense of a mere unanimity, but in the sense of an essential, real unity, comparable to the unity of the persons of the Most Holy Trinity." There is a certain gleam of hope in this world of division, which consists of maternal, or sometimes conjugal, love: "to suddenly lose all taste for one's personal life." "A mother has practically no sense of her own separate life." This is the archetype of pastoral love, the highest degree of "such a dispersion of one's individuality." The Apostle Paul "loses his personal life" so that Christ might live in him. "The unity of the pastor with Christ and with his flock is not something established only intellectually, but is an actual and essential unity." Antonii stresses this point with a surprising vehemence. "This is not unanimity, but a unity of essence, like the unity of the Father with the Son." This is a unity of generic being, which was disturbed or weakened through the fall, but is manifested and restored again in the New Adam. In him people once again become open to one another. He who is joined with Christ can "enter into the nature of his neighbors," communicating to them "a part of his substance."

The pastoral vocation is also the construction of a mysterious unity, the body of Christ. To confirm his interesting idea of the unity of mankind, Antonii cites St. Gregory of Nyssa's *That There are not Three Gods,* brings up a characteristic quotation from the eighteenth chapter of St. Basil's *Ascetikon*, and refers as well to St. John Chrysostom.[231] However, he tosses out ideas more than he develops them, leaving them without a full explanation. Terms and concepts such as "unity of nature," "unity of kind," "will," "personality," and so on,

are left without definitive or precise formulation and are thereby easily subject to diverse interpretations. There are sufficient grounds to doubt that Antonii employs his patristic references in a manner required by the comprehensive interrelationship of views found in any given father.

Antonii's teaching on the pastorate is organically linked to his understanding of the dogma of redemption. "In spite of the theological systems of the schools, divine redemption consists chiefly of the restoration of unity of love accomplished by the new revelation of grace and the obedience of the people towards God, towards the Savior, and among themselves." The struggle in Gethsemane must be acknowledged as basic to this redemptive work. In the *Catechism*, which he wrote at a later date, Antonii gives the following formulation: "Why did Christ's inner, heartfelt torments over human sinfulness manifest themselves as our redemption? Because a love that shares our suffering united his spirit with ours, and thus we can draw from the spirit of Christ as from a spring of sanctity, thereby conquering sin."[232] Antonii links the struggle in Gethsemane with the "most natural" prayer of the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of John. However, in this interpretation, the death on the cross is somehow left in the shadows.

Antonii's moral excitation and sensitivity, his impressionability and attention to the moral searchings of the people and contemporary society, attracted many from the very outset. To these searchings he applied the Savior's words: "You are not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark 12:34). He had in view here both the moral ascent in educated society, reflected in literature, and the "mystical-moral animation of the people," so deftly utilized by the sectarians. "Thus, nearly all of the secular tendencies of our social and national life are not far from it—this is a ripening field awaiting only the laborers of the harvest in order to become God's wheat." Hence his emphatic insistence on the pastor's need to know "life and science," particularly "from the vantage point of their allurement for contemporary man, and equally for their influence on man's moral life." He particularly underscored the importance of literature, and considered Dostoevskii a teacher of life. With unconcealed irony he speaks about the zealots who preserve their faith mostly through simple habit, and "thus they are all afraid to read secular books." They fear for themselves and for their unconscious faith. "Hence their exclusivity and intolerance, as sell as the endless talk of the contradiction between knowledge and faith, the religion of uncontrolled feeling, the destructiveness of specu-

lative reason, the danger of religious disputes, and even their lack of sympathy for heterodox who accept Orthodoxy."

Antonii had a most acute sense for the inner autonomy of the Church, as something not of this world. Hence the absolute distinction between all forms of church activity and secular life. The pastor must guard in every way against inner or spiritual secularization, against infection by formalism or legalism, and be even more watchful for spiritual constraint. One must operate through the truth of words and not crush conscience with authority. The kingdom of God is constructed on earth only through the power of spiritual regeneration. The "refinement of morals comes through the efforts of free souls, not through political institutions." This leads Antonii into a theoretical clash with the state. The Russian Church is in captivity to the state. "It has been deprived of a legal head and handed over in subjection to lay bureaucrats." The Synod is a completely uncanonical institution "unknown to holy Orthodoxy and conceived solely for the purpose of weakening and dismembering it." The Synod is not at all a conciliar administration. "The Orthodox Church has been enslaved to this institution." Antonii believed in the Church's summons to build the kingdom of God in society, yet he too decisively cuts off the Church from the world, and the world, when left to its own fate, turns out to be a particularly restless rival. Antonii always feared ecclesiastical interference as an act of becoming part of the world. However, his principle of ascetical noninterference meant, in practice, a retreat in the face of the world, even if it is thought of as a victorious withdrawal from the world.

The chief weakness of Antonii's ecclesiastico-practical scheme does not, however, lie in this essentially applied question. Much more important is his excessive moralism, his moralistic psychologism. His constant reiteration that Christianity is a "religion of the conscience" becomes tiresome. Moreover, the priesthood is almost totally eclipsed by the pastorate. The sacramental moment remains entirely unexpressed, both in the life of the Church and in constructive pastoral work. Antonii once upbraided Vladimir Solov'ev precisely for the latter's sacramentalism.

> We cannot agree with the author's apparent allotting to the duties of the pastor only the performance of the sacraments, which he regards not as moral acts ("let us love one another that with one mind we may confess"), but only as "mysterious" acts, as if they were a form of sacred

> magic. He loves to talk of the sacraments as the material means of grace, the spiritual-mystical body of the Church, etc.[233]

Antonii obviously failed to notice that his reprimand struck not only at Solov'ev, but at a long line of fathers from St. John Chrysostom or even from St. Ignatius of Antioch, with his "medicine of immortality," down to Nicholas Cabasilas and St. Symeon the New Theologian.

As the purpose of pastoral activity Antonii advances not the priesthood but rather concern for "social welfare." One need only compare his essays on pastoral theology with Fr. Ioann of Kronshtadt's *Diary* in order to sense the incompleteness and utter spiritual incoherency of this one-sided moralism. Strictly speaking, this represents the ideal of active altruism, only now transferred to the Church. Antonii has a great deal to say about prayer and justly sees in it the fundamental principle for pastoral action. Yet he says too little about the sacraments. Moreover, he understands prayer itself somewhat psychologically, as a way of surmounting spiritual isolation. It is characteristic that he considers the "dogmatism" in the liturgical office (in St. John of Damascus and others) to be a "step down" in comparison with the full inspiration of the first centuries, although liturgical poetry still retains a great deal of spiritual rapture and contemplation. Antonii regards later "Byzantinism" much more dryly, complaining that "our religious consciousness has been wholly reared in this exclusively negative mentality of spiritual self-development, which has been exhausted in the singular struggle with the passions and which knows very little about the positive fruits of the kingdom of God and a life of joyous love for man." A certain aftertaste of humanistic optimism is always apparent in Antonii. With some foundation he traces his pastoral outlook back to patristic sources, yet the influence of contemporary literature is much stronger. He is psychologically much closer to Slavophile publicistics than even to the Russian *Philokalia*. For all his distaste for "western erudition" he remained too closely tied to it. Renunciation of western books does not mean being free of the western spirit.

Contemporaries had already noted the similarity between Antonii's ideas on pastoral theology and those expressed in S. A. Sollertinskii's *The Pastorate of Christ the Savior (1887).* [234] There is an obvious return here to the ground of "western erudition." For Sollertinskii the pastorate is exhausted in the "job of Christian teaching," and redemption itself is explained in terms of teaching: "a communication to the people of true understanding and the true purposes

of human activity." This is expressed in the basic name "Son of Man." In Sollertinskii's view the Sermon on the Mount is the "Symbol of Faith" of the primordial Church, a kind of program for the kingdom of God. Antonii moves within the same sphere of ideas.

Antonii's moralism can be felt all the more acutely in his dogmatic experiments. At the beginning of the 1890s the need for a new theological synthesis became still more strongly felt. "Scholastic" theology had long ceased to be satisfactory, while the "historical" method did not exactly produce a synthesis or create any system. A way out was sought in the moral explanation of dogma. Dogmatics was restructured from the moral point of view, and Antonii became one of the luminaries of the new theology. The apologetic task always emanates from him; he strives to justify dogma on the basis of moral awareness. His justification is not that dogmas have a moral application, but that they contain a certain "moral truth," based within them. Thus, when the impenetrability of the "I" and the "not-I" is removed, the truth of the Triune God is seen as an archetype for human unity and love. Here, too, is the moral idea in the dogma of the Church. The dogma of the Triune God gives a "metaphysical foundation to the moral imperative of love," just as the doctrine of a reward beyond the grave provides grounds for the virtue of patience. Virtue is grounded neither in individualism nor pantheism. "At this point the assistance of the Holy Trinity appears, that most blessed and truest existence, in which the freedom and eternity of the persons does not shatter the unity, in which there is room for the free personality, but in which there is no unconditional personal self-reservation. Teaching about love is an inner law, not a formal duty, and yet the love of one another is not self-love, so that it fully preserves the meaning of moral love." It would be useless to ever hope to overcome division in existence and in each human soul if the Holy Trinity had not been revealed. "Without this holy dogma, the gospel commandment on love would be powerless." Antonii applies dogma to "moral experience," not to spiritual contemplation.

In metaphysics Antonii is much more cautious than the Holy Fathers were, and this is his weakness. He undoubtedly resembles Kant and the method of the second *Critique*. Is Antonii's "moral experience" not identical with "practical reason"? Does the justification of dogma not lie in the fact that the ideal premises of virtue are realized in it? Antonii himself admits that Kant "had an almost infallible ability to extract the practical idea from every truth of faith." Antonii's doctrine on redemption sharply reveals the total insufficiency of the moral interpretation of dogma.

Beneath this doctrine one can sense a vital and genuine spiritual experience, a certain personal encounter with Christ as the Savior.

> His sufferings for my sins are manifiestations of my redemption, his great patience is my salvation, and not simply in the sense of an inspiring example, but in a real sense, that by knowing Jesus Christ, who through love for me wept for my sinfulness, I, by my own efforts to walk in the way of his light, make my own essence through his properties; for in him I live, and in him I enliven the new man in myself.

Yet in spite of all the authenticity of his experience, there remains in him an insurmountable aftertaste of psychologism or pietism. He acquires neither objectivity nor metaphysical perspective. As a result, Antonii decidedly deviates from the tradition and standard set by the Holy Fathers. He simply reasons on a different plane. The issue, after all, is not the substitution of a principle of love, which is more becoming to God, for an excessively "juridical" understanding of "satisfaction." One must understand and explain the place of redemption in the economical plan as it is being objectively realized. Acertically, and with a complete lack of restraint, Antonii rejects the "school-catechetical" teaching, or the so-called "juridical theory," which had actually been adopted from the western scholastics: "I shall never call it a part of the Church." However, he goes much farther, finding the very notion of "sacrifice" to be misplaced. The Gospels he explains in a metaphorical and figurative sense, and in attempting to explain the meaning of the death on the cross he falls into the most excruciating impressionism. "Christ's physical suffering and bodily death were necessary, above all, so that the believers would appreciate the power of his spiritual sufferings, which were incomparably more intense than his bodily torments." Fallen man, however, is a slave to insensitivity. He cannot penetrate the mystery of spiritual sorrow without a feeling of shock. "Our nature is so base, so enslaved by bodily sensations and fear of death, that it would be very hard to genuinely comprehend the purely spiritual sufferings that occurred during Christ's weeping for the sins of others, if they had not been accompanied by the bodily sufferings and the insults from those around him." The purifying blood, the saving cross, the life-bearing grave–all are only images, conveying a "common understanding" of the redemptive passion. "Here is a treasury of the most impressive moments of his exploit." Antonii does allow "that through the link

between body and soul we find here a more profound and mysterious meaning." Yet what is most important for the one who is saved is this impression, this feeling of tenderness, which the crucifixion evokes in him. "Christ's sorrow for us unites us with him, and this very grief, by becoming the subject of our hope and love, creates us anew."

Antonii's train of thought leads to the denial of primordial sin. Human sinfulness is interpreted in a wholly atomistic manner, which stands in contradiction to his doctrine on the unity of human nature. "Adam was not so much the one guilty for our sinfulness as he was the first in time to commit a sin, and even if we had not been his descendants, we would nevertheless have sinned." In any event, "our birth from sinful ancestors is not the sole reason for our sinful condition." There is a special divine arrangement here. "Knowing in advance that each of us would acquire Adam's self-will, God taxes us at birth with a mortal and fallen nature, i.e., with ready-made sinful impulses, from which we discover our nothingness and are humbled." Moreover, "it is not because we are descendants of Adam that all of us are sinners, even when we exercise our will towards the good, but because the Omniscient One grants us life as people (and not angels, for example), and because he foresaw that each of our wills would be similar to the will of Adam, i.e., essentially not evil but disobedient and proud, and consequently demanding a school of correction, which is manifested as our physical life on earth."

What is immediately striking in this artificial scheme is the rationalism and primitiveness of the deductions, the theologizing from common sense, and the stubborn violation of the evidence of revelation. Antonii himself defines his theory as the "conversion of all theology into moral monism." He does not verify the ontological presuppositions of his teaching–he is simply not interested in them. He makes absolutely no connection between his interpretation and the Chalcedonian dogma of the two natures or the definition of the Sixth Ecumenical Council concerning the two wills.[235] The image of Christ the Savior remains quite vague in his portrayal. Antonii is constantly preoccupied with a single question: "Why did the saving incarnation, passion, and resurrection of Christ occur for us?" Why and how is his life, his sanctity, and his victory communicated to us, imputed to us, or acquired by us? The only answer that he seems to find satisfactory is "moral monism." Our salvation is a rebirth. Hence, "a love that suffers with us, that beholds the fall of another with such sadness that it seems as if it was the one who gives love who had sinned," renews us. Compassion means suffering for another. Antonii traces the experience of the Savior from human and worldly experience.

"One must suppose that on that night in Gethsemane the thought and feeling of the God-man embraced the many millions of the fallen and wept with a loving sadness for each one individually—a thing possible, of course, only for the divine omniscient heart. In this is our redemption." For all its incompleteness, Antonii's worldview possessed a great integrity. Yet he did not achieve a theological synthesis. "Moral monism" did not prove a sturdy enough foundation for that.

The predilection for a "moral" interpretation of dogma became, for a time, dominant in Russian theology. Here one should note A.D. Beliav's book, *Divine Love: An Experiment in Revealing the Most Important Christian Dogmas on the Basis of Divine Love,* first issued in 1880.[236] This book was written in the old style, with the decisive influence of German speculative theology and a surprising disregard for the works of the fathers. The author claims that, with the sole exception of Augustine, there is a "poverty and insignificance" to the patristic material on love, and he refuses to consider the Holy Fathers as a source. The book contains many fresh ideas and observations, yet its rationalistic psychologism is striking. The author attempts to grasp the psychology of the sacrifice and passion of the Savior, his obedience and grief, etc. He gives too much attention to the moment of struggle in Gethsemane. "Everything that is tormenting in the spiritual death of all people he felt, lived through, and endured in his heart." Christ even passed through the punishment of the condition of "eternal death," i.e., complete alienation from God. In this, it would seem, is the "boundlessness of the sacrifice of the cross." This was how the question of self-emptying, *kenosis,* was first posed in Russian dogmatics.

P. Ia. Svetlov's *The Meaning of the Cross in Christ's Work* (Kiev, 1893; 2nd ed., Kiev, 1907) was a more balanced book.[237] Svetlov begins by attentively reexamining and analyzing the texts and testimonies of the Holy Fathers. His goal was precisely to oppose the western "juridical" theory with patristic doctrine. However, he employs the patristic evidence with a characteristic one-sidedness. Svetlov utterly lacks a doctrine of man—a failing he shares with Antonii. Its place is taken by moral psychology, a doctrine of sin and rebirth. All the more one senses the psychological influence of Protestantism and the departure from patristics. Theology is here reworked according to the empirical method, as a realm of facts. There is no room for metaphysics. Svetlov is constantly preoccupied with psychological analysis. Before Christ, man was not able to believe in the good, in love, or forgiveness. Neither was he able to have confidence in himself.

In Christ it was revealed that man is better than one could previously have thought possible. "Through him we come to love man, to believe in him, and discover the meaning of life." Christ reveals in himself the truth of man. "The Gospels saved our respect for man, our faith in his capacity for the good." Through his teaching Christ awakens love in people for him, and his love leads to the "sympathetic act of imitation." Yet Christ is more than just the teacher of truth–he is also the "sufferer for truth and the good." After all, in this world the good itself already is suffering, "the good is the cross." Before Christ, man was frightened by suffering, which was a punishment and a sign of wrath. But through Christ suffering, as a sacrifice, becomes a joy. "The Christian religion is a religion of the cross, i.e., of suffering by the good in order to achieve victory over evil."[238] It is impossible to understand the cross outside of the idea of sacrifice.

At this point Svetlov diverges decisively from Antonii. His understanding of sacrifice is his key to the dogma of redemption. The highest sacrifice is love, and in this love is the power of Christ's sacrifice. "Satisfaction" is offered to the God of love, and that which is offered is love itself.

> Christ, in his holy suffering along with and for mankind, experiences in himself the judgment placed upon mankind, the entire fate appointed by sin, and through this suffering along with and for mankind he mingles himself with humanity, fully expressing a love for both mankind and God the Father. . . . Christ suffers for the people, and not separately from them, but together with them. . . . His suffering was a co-suffering–he is not only the Sufferer, but the Co-Sufferer.

This participation in Christ's sacrifice is granted to us in the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice and sacrament, "without which the sacrifice offered on the cross could not have been accomplished." Once again Svetlov diverges from Antonii, stressing the expiatory significance of the descent into hell, the resurrection, and the ascension. Our salvation is completed with the formation of the Church.

Much closer to Antonii is Sergii Stragorodskii, who later became Patriarch of Moscow.[239] His book, *Orthodox Doctrine and Salvation* (1895), goes no further than the "moral-subjective aspect" of dogma. Orthodox doctrine is portrayed in opposition to that of the West. The opposition is one of the moral view against the legal view. Sergii strives to exclude every heteronomism from the doctrine of salvation.

One cannot ask why man receives salvation, but one must ask "how man effects salvation." Sergii quite convincingly demonstrates the identity between bliss and virtue, between salvation and perfection, so that one cannot speak here of an eternal reward. Eternal life is not only something awaited beyond the grave, but is the good itself, and thus is already possessed now. Sergii correctly depicts the process of moral conversion from sin to God. However, the objective side of the process remains very much in the shadows. Even Antonii once pointed out that Sergii speaks very incautiously about the sacraments, especially about baptism, "or repentance." (The "or" by itself is characteristic.) One gets the impression that the moral revolution, the decision "to put an end to sinning," is what is decisive in the sacraments. Man is renewed by repentance. "The thread of life is, as it were, snapped." The assistance of grace merely reinforces the decision taken by the will, "the act of freedom." Performance of the sacraments is therefore not unconditionally necessary "once the essence of the true Christian—the desire for the kingdom of God—has been formed in someone."

Martyrdom, even without the shedding of blood, is in an inner sense identical with baptism. "Both the one and the other proceed from the same irrevocable decision to serve Christ and from the renunciation of one's sinful desires." To put it even more bluntly: "The essence of a sacrament lies in reinforcing man's zeal for the good. We are saved through mercy and by faith. Through faith we recognize mercy and discover the love of God, which consists of the fact that sin has been forgiven and no longer blocks the way to God. We recognize in God the Father, and not the Terrible Master [*Groznyi Vladyka*]."

Sergii set for himself the task of deriving theology from experience, from the experience of the spiritual life, and therein lies the significance of his book. This return to the fathers in principle was very important. However, Sergii unjustifiably brings everything contained in patristic theology to a psychologically interpreted asceticism. No less characteristic for the fathers is their metaphysical realism. And least of all can one employ patristics as a basis for justifying moralism and psychologism, and the same goes for an exaggerated voluntarism in asceticism. After all, contemplation remains as the highest point of ascent. In any event, one cannot substitute asceticism for dogmatics, and neither can one dissolve dogmatics in asceticism. Such a temptation is always an indication of a theological decline. The Russian school of "moral monism" exhibited precisely this sign of decay. It contained no contemplative inspiration, while possessing too much psychological

self-analysis. This was undoubtedly an echo of western theological moods, and represented also an excessive concentration on the problem of justification. What was necessary was a more complete and more humble return to the fathers.

XII

MAKSIM MATVEEVICH TAREEV

The most extreme representative of moralism in Russian theology was Maksim Matveevich Tareev (1866-1934).[240] Tareev occupied the chair of moral theology at Moscow Academy. The basic contours of his theological system were already delineated in his first book, *The Temptation of the God-Man* [*Iskushenie Bogocheloveka*]. "My first work . . . already contained the entire system of my Christian philosophy, and may be equated with the *Foundations of Christianity.*[241] All my subsequent writings merely represent the further elaboration of the theses given there."

For Tareev, the entire meaning of Christianity is contained in the idea of "religious temptation." This is one of the keys to his system. "Religious temptation" is strictly distinguished from "moral temptation," which presupposes carnal desire and loss of innocence. "Religious temptation" is the temptation of thought, the temptation of living contradictions. More accurately, what we have here is not as much contradiction as a lack of correspondence between the ideal man, created in the image of God, and man's practical limitations and restrictions. "Religious temptations are possible only for a being that is limited yet God-like, and they befall man independently of his moral condition." In other words, this is a divine-human temptation in essence and content. The acuteness of the temptation lies in the intention and desire to "violate the laws of this limitedness in the name of one's divine principle, to satisfy by one's endless effort and thereby affirm one's divine dignity within one's given limited exclusivity." This is the religious sin of self-justification and self-affirmation, the attitude of "religious protest." Religious temptation is overcome through faith and submissiveness, "through faith in man's dignity of being a son of God, which is undisturbed by the limitedness of the given reality of his life." Such limitedness must be accepted and en-

dured, for it does not violate the "divine law" of personal inner life. Christ's victory, his "condescension," is in his *kenosis*, the subordination of his divine life to the conditions and laws of human existence. The "revelation of divine life in Christ must be understood in such a way that the fulness of revelation is dependent on the fulness of human life."

The image of Christ remains quite obscure in Tareev's outline. While not rejecting dogmas and dogmatic formulas, he highly restricts their meaning and applicability, hurriedly pushing them aside in order to return to the "evangelical truth" that for many they nearly screen from view. Yet for Tareev the Gospels do not represent the historical image of Christ, but rather a symbol of his life, a "religious-creative depiction," the "evangelical idea clothed in symbols"–divine life revealed within the limitedness of historical existence. Such is the "evangelical idea" that Tareev attempts to disclose and demonstrate.

> The Christ of the Gospels is the only man who lives wholly for the work of God; a heavenly man, a soul filled with a single religious idea; the only Son of God, who has practically no contact with the earth, almost no stain of historical life, not the slightest earthly dust. . . . Christ himself was conscious of his life as the revelation of the Father. Christ's self-perception was not his by self-deception, abstract thought, or invention. His self-awareness was direct and natural, and it was so real that it directed his entire life.

The Gospels reveal Christ's religious experience in symbols, and that experience contains what is wholly new in Christianity. This is the experience (and the example) of blessed self-renunciation. "He was the first to carry sacrifice to fulfillment, the first to build his entire life on the blessedness of self-renunciation, the first to be wholly imbued with the divine act, to the point of forgetting earthly nourishment and worldly blessings." Moreover, in this experience the divine was revealed and demonstrated as love. Everything in Christianity is exhausted through this revelation of love or the fatherhood of God–it contains salvation, the gift of eternal spiritual life. "Love is in essence divine, and only divine." In Christ, love "was a manifestation of a non-human life." Thus, human love is impossible. Love abolishes and abrogates all outer or objectified reality. "Christian love, as the ideal, as a commandment, is absolutely incomprehensible, unthinkable, impossible. Christian love is a spiritual gift, which dominates everything through

the power of passion and contains within itself all the rapture of mystical beauty."

Each Christian must in and for himself somehow repeat the kenotic exploit of the Master of Life, relive Christ's experience–the "creative experience"–within himself. He must surmount "religious temptation" and be reconciled with the submissiveness of being a son of God. "The Gospels teach us that man can, in the conditions of temporal existence, live a divinely spiritual life, which is man's true and eternal life." Tareev stresses that "nowhere in the entire Gospels is the word 'hope' found," which means that everything has already been granted and is obtainable. There is no need to wait, for the kingdom of God does not depend on time or on the "formal continuation of history." The kingdom of God is not connected to time, but has eternally been revealed in "intimate experience," in the "inner experience," in the inner absoluteness of the spirit. "If inner religious absoluteness neither acquires nor loses anything in the coming centuries, then of course coming history does not follow from the evangelical idea, is not demanded by it, and appears only as an external, accidental appendage to it."

Tareev's radical antihistoricism is connected to his basic premise: two fully disconnected and dissimilarly governed worlds exist, "and there are no passages directly leading from the one realm to the other." There is an outer, historical world, which operates according to its own laws, natural "ethical reason," and there neither is nor can be any evangelical or Christian norm for this world. Then there is the world of personal life, of religious intimacy. However, this latter realm has no historical dimension. In other words, Christianity, properly speaking, has nothing to do in history, for it is impossible to do anything in history. The Church acquires her children from this world, but any interference in the external life is a violation of the world's natural freedom. Historical Christianity symbolically sanctifies earthly life, but for the world this is already an ascetical persecution, an "ascetical truncation of life" (compare this with Solov'ev). For Christianity this represents a restriction and a substitution–a substitution of symbols for truth. Is spiritual life not replaced in historical Orthodoxy by the symbolism of the liturgy? Christianity is a personal exploit, not a historical process. And once again this exploit is *kenosis*. The Christian lives according to a double norm–the religious and the natural–and is called to combine his intimate religiosity with the fullness of this natural life. "Christian history does not mean Christianity's progress." The progress of Christianity does not lie in history. After all, the entire meaning of the historical process is merely so that divine

glory might suffuse the "nothingness" or limitedness of carnal life, so that divine life might appear. As for history itself, it has no purpose, it contains no meaning.

The Church, for Tareev, is a "secondary" or "derivative reality in Christianity," "Christianity's historical form," a moral organization or "pious society." Christianity acquires a natural and historical significance and becomes a cultural force only in the form of the Church. However, in Tareev's scale of values history itself is secondary, and it is precisely in history that Christianity pales. "Inner Christianity, like eternity, is entirely divine and immutable. The Church has an earthly aspect, bears the traits of human conditionality, and develops historically. In the Church, the pure Christianity of the personality is covered with earthly dust: it glows with dark colors, it moves and develops." This is all simply an outer plane, a realm of conditionality and symbols. The essence of Christianity is in its intimacy, "in the religious absoluteness of the good, in the absolute value of the personality."

Tareev began constructing his system "across the street from" dogmatics, emphasizing that he was building his own personal worldview, "a personal understanding of Christianity, a personal religious worldview," and that one simply could not compare it with church doctrines, which bear only a general significance, for it exists on another level. A certain valuation, however, inadvertently and immediately creeps in: the "evangelical idea" is higher than any belief or dogmatic "symbol"; "religious intimacy," the "approach to pure divinity," is higher than any doctrine or rule. "Theology's past was a time of the undivided sway of dogmatics. . . theology's future shall unfurl beneath the banner of the subjective method of religious philosophy, the ethical-mystical study of Christianity." Tareev's ethics, however, are of an utterly special sort: "Evangelical teaching does not know the notions of conscience, natural freedom, and natural moral law."

Tareev did not complete his system, stopping at methodological questions. He wanted to transpose all of Christianity into the "language of spiritual experience." What this means is not quite clear. Although he expresses himself with considerable pathos, there is little precision. "The appreciating, believing relationship, in contrast to objective knowledge, is the only thing that matters here. The one who knows is completely transported, all in motion, with outstretched arms, gazing into the distance, heart enflamed. . . the task here is to steep all Christian formulas, all theological understanding, in the aroma of experience, in the fragrance of mystical experience." To put it concisely, teaching about value is being advanced to replace teaching

about being. "This is already not the perspective of actual being, but the perspective of true being, of valued being." In other words, this is not the realm of knowledge, but of appreciation.

What Tareev does not want, what he rejects, is much clearer. Above all, it is objectivity. "Spiritual learning recoils from objective, logically compelling judgments." He even admits to an "organic aversion" for objectivism, and therefore also for mysticism—the naturalistic "experience of ecstasy, visions, and apparitions," or, in other words, the "Greco-Eastern spirit," "the philosophy of a dead estheticism." Tareev eventually came to have grave doubts about the acceptability of the very "Greco-Eastern conception of Christianity." It was not church doctrine itself that he had in mind, but rather the "systems of ancient Christian thinkers," i.e., patristics. "We need to be freed from the Byzantine yoke."

In his last book, *Christian Philosophy* (Moscow, 1917), Tareev rejected and refuted the very "principle of a fatherhood," that is to say, the principle of tradition. In a certain sense the Word of God and tradition are of equal value, but they are of a wholly different character—one cannot be substituted for the other, they speak of different things. The Word of God contains the essence of Christianity; tradition is merely an ecclesiastical code, with only a conditional meaning and significance, limited by the social environment. This relates to dogma itself: "The value of dogma lies in the unity of church life." In intimate experience dogma is unknown ("the phantom of dogmatism"). "Dogma is necessary inasmuch as the Church is one, inasmuch as the unity of church life is necessary." Dogma, however, by its formal authority does not restrain theological freedom. "Ecclesiastical-dogmatic teaching is expressed in logical-abstract formulas, which command no mystical, experiential content, and thus do not restrict the creative path of Christian thought." Patristic systems restrict theological freedom only when a "dogmatic dignity" is attributed to them, which occurs either through hierarchical arbitrariness or through the arbitrariness of dogmatic writers. Tareev rejects every form of intellectualism, which in his view was inherited by the fathers from classical philosophy. Spiritual philosophy is the philosophy of the heart. The "spiritually wise man," he stresses, "never follows the path of theoretical objectivism. . . he thinks exclusively and sequentially with moral-mystical evaluations of the heart." This is outright opposition to patristics.

> The teaching of the Holy Fathers is entirely gnostic. . . . Gnosticism and asceticism are what we were given by Greek

> tradition. The literature of the Holy Fathers served as a means for the transmission of a foreign, nationalistic Greek, collapsed, gnostic-ascetic worldview and understanding of life into our culture. . . . Gnosticism and asceticism–the sworn enemies of the Russian genius. . . Byzantine asceticism poisoned our will and disfigured our entire history.

Tareev wished to counterpose Russian and Greek tradition. He prepared a book on the history of Russian theology, in which he portrayed Russian tradition as the philosophy of the heart; he wanted to connect Platon Levshin with Feofan the Recluse.[242] Tareev himself was absolutely swept away by this new wave of imitative pietism, although not before he had spent a long and difficult time with a very complex theory of *kenosis*. He does not speak about spiritual or Christian philosophy so habitually for nothing. He is precisely a philosopher, a "wise man," instead of a theologian. He presents the "evangelical idea" in a sufficiently philosophical garb, and philosophical motifs work at least as powerfully on him as do "evangelical" ones. Yet he is inspired not by metaphysics but by the "philosophy of life." No matter how much he underscores his distance from Rudolf Lotze and from the latest "theories of value" and pragmatism, his conception belongs to that same doctrinal type.[243]

Tareev had no disciples. He more readily provoked opposition than met with sympathy. As his principles themselves properly required, he remained a singular and solitary thinker. But precisely in this solitude he characterizes the era. To "refrain from objectivity" even recalls the Russian subjective school" of sociology, to which Tareev makes reference. The principle of religious intimacy generally typifies the moralistic modernism of the end of the nineteenth century in the West, and this western current rapidly spread in Russia. Ethics was counterposed to dogmatics, and an attempt was made to replace dogmatics with ethics. Prince Sergei N. Trubetskoi in his day decisively objected to all this. Tareev shared the mood of the average man of his era. Dogmatics had very little to say to him; it did not answer the questions of the believing heart.

> The dogmatician does not respond to the questions. His goal is to formulate Christianity in the terms of philosophy. He teaches about that which was when there was nothing, what happens in heaven and what will be beyond the grave, but he does not have any words, and terms, for expressing

that which occurs in the Christian soul now, here on earth. His language is entirely unsuited to such themes.

These are the typical objections of a philistine against "abstract" philosophy. At the same time, they represent an exodus from history, yet another symptom of a collapsed utopianism that in personal life leads one away from the useless vanity of historical construction.[244]

XIII

THE THEOLOGICAL MORALISM OF VIKTOR NESMELOV

In theology one can proceed in two ways: from the higher or from the lower, from God or from man, from revelation or from experience. Patristics and scholasticism take the first path, while "modern theology" prefers the second. Theological moralism is one form of the anthropological inclination, though not the only one. In his two-volume work *Science and Man*, Viktor Ivanovich Nesmelov (1863-1920), a professor at the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy, made a unique experiment in the anthropological construction of a theological system.[245] As a young man Nesmelov studied patrology and wrote a fundamental study of St. Gregory of Nyssa (1886). However, in his philosophical development his critical disillusionment becomes more and more pronounced. Under the powerful influence of empiricism, he for a time denied the possibility of metaphysics, transferring the question of God beyond the limits of philosophy, as a question only for faith. In his later constructions these impressions are even more powerfully felt.

Nesmelov consciously begins from man, proceeding from the data of inner experience or self-consciousness. The "enigma of man," which is the sole enigma in the world, is for him the prime mover in religious development. Berdiaev aptly says of Nesmelov: "He has converted Feuerbach's basic idea on the anthropological mystery of religion into a weapon for the defense of Christianity." Nesmelov himself notes his affinity with Feuerbach. Man's enigma lies in his duality: "Man, by the very nature of his personality, necessarily dis-

plays in himself an unconditional existence, while at the same time he actually exists as a simple thing of the physical world."

What is enigmatic is the non-correspondence and the contradiction between the "unconditional character" and the "conditional being" of the human personality. Through self-consciousness man transcends the limits of this world, and not just in his desires or goals. Man's very nature feels constrained by the limits of the material world, and through his very condition of being "God's living image" he testifies to God's being. The human personality "directly affirms, by the fact of its ideal reality, the objective existence of God as the True Personality." Yet contradiction yields guilt (the "abnormal state of worldly being"). Also characteristic of man is the desire to be free of the natural world, for he has been summoned to a better and truer life. To lead a purely material or natural life is not befitting of a God-like being. The fall is itself proof of the duality of man's existence.

> Man wished to become God. . . . He created an unusual illusion as regards himself . . . Yet the same circumstances by which man was able to seduce himself with the desire for divine life, that he was able to be dissatisfied with his actual position in the world and reject that position—these same circumstances in and of themselves prove that man was not an accidental generation of the earth, and he is not innately the slave of nature.

Man was not born but became the slave of nature, and here lies the entire tragedy of the fall: man included himself in nature. "He made his spirit a part of the general chain of worldly things." The significance of the fall lies in the fact that the first man did not wish to achieve his high goal along the path of spiritual freedom and fidelity to the will of God, but rather via external nature, along the path of magic and superstition. In such fashion the first people diminished and reduced themselves "to the level of simple things of the world." Man was introduced into the world as one who acts, as a realizer, not just as the realization of God's design, but man did not realize this plan. He created the world of crime, the evil world in which he (precisely as a "man-thing" now lives. "The fact of evil is undoubtedly the same thing as the fact of the fall." This world is man's creation. "By his crime man destroyed the world that was actually created by God."

Christ saves man, and he saves him by his death on the cross and his resurrection. Nesmelov decisively rejects every "juridical"

explanation of redemption and salvation in terms of reward, recompense, ransom, or chastisement. However, death and resurrection constitute the "sole" real escape from sin and evil. The world was created anew and altered by Christ, but in such a way that the condition of its effective existence remains inviolate. Death eliminates sin or guilt. But normal death destroys man. Hence, although it eliminates sin, the normal martyr's death is insufficient. Christ arose from the dead, and his resurrection reinforced the meaning of his death as liberation from sin. Christ's death was a sacrifice and a self-sacrifice. The Son of God died for man. "Christ accepted death, precisely the martyr's death, for the sake of the truth of his moral service to God in spirit and in truth. . . . His martyr's death for his fidelity to God's law of life actually constitutes the greatest victory over evil."

Here Nesmelov possesses an original motif. Only the Son of God, as creator of the world, is able ("has the basis," as Nesmelov characteristically puts it) to "take" sin or receive unto himself the sin of the world–all the sins of the world.

> If he had not created the world, then sin would not exist and there would be no death from it. In other words, he alone can answer for the origin and existence of the world and for the reality of the basis and purpose of its divine createdness. This very responsibility constituted a sufficient basis for him to reveal the miracle of his saving love to a sinful world, for because of his role as creator of the world he, as the creator of the whole world, permitted himself to be accused of all the crimes of the sinful world.

Thus, the very movement of divine love is subtly rationalized from within. However, even though sin has been transferred–"to the Prime Bearer of Guilt of all creation"–and thereby destroyed, salvation still requires personal participation, repentance, spiritual exploit, and faith in the justification of Christ. Only those who seek are saved.

> The person who does not admit the necessity of redemption cannot, of course, desire that his sins be removed from him by Christ, and therefore he remains in his sins. He who admits the necessity of redemption but who does not believe in the redeeming power of Jesus Christ's death on the cross likewise cannot, of course, desire that Christ remove his sins, and therefore he also remains in his sins.

However, through God's mercy there is hope for forgiveness in the future life. Salvation is fulfilled only in the coming resurrection. Christ alone resurrects. Before the Second Coming only the host of angels are found in Christ's kingdom; until that time the righteous still await everything and only believe.

Nesmelov had a unique concept of the resurrection. On the day of resurrection Christ will give to each person "the power of the creativity of life," and through this power the souls of the dead will "instantly expand their own creative activity and fashion their future bodies for themselves." These will be new bodies, suited to the new conditions of the world, but personal identity will not be diminished. The world will perish and be transformed. "The divine power of Christ the Savior will instantly transfigure the chaos of the disunited elements of the perishing world (in the terrible flames of a world conflagration) into a new, glorious world of God's kingdom." As Nesmelov puts it, by the resurrection of Christ, "the law of the resurrection of the dead has been introduced"–just as the "law of inescapable death" was introduced through the fall of the first ancestors. In Christ human nature "became God's own body, and remains in him, as his eternal body." In Christ's humanity all mankind partook of eternity. "Since Christ's resurrection from the dead, each man is a bearer of eternal nature . . . for each man bears within himself the same nature that Christ made eternal. Thus, through one's human nature, which is also Christ's nature, each person is necessarily a member of the eternal body of Christ."

Nesmelov speaks in vague and unconvincing terms of the ultimate destiny of the world. There are too many artificial hypotheses and conjectures. He considers as likely the universal forgiveness of all men, "exclusively through the mercy of a saving God." Sin can be forgiven man also in the future life. Nesmelov furthermore allows that some among the fallen spirits who "believe and tremble" will be forgiven. He finds the idea of the apokatastasis convincing "in the realm of rationalistic consideration." The last judgment and the resurrection will be the restoration of a world destroyed by the fall. "Nevertheless, the Almighty God will realize his eternal idea of being and will truly reign in the world." All that is good will be saved, but evil cannot pass into eternity. Evil deeds will perish along with the present world, and only the people guilty of evil–not their evil deeds–will pass into the eternal world of the resurrection. Nesmelov carries his entire "metaphysic of life" to a certain paradox, the paradox of an "unsuccessful revelation." One must immediately recognize a duality about the world. "The world does not serve as the revelation of God, but *is* the revela-

tion of God." This is the same duality that man reveals within himself. The "failure" largely depends on man. Nesmelov's construction contains a fundamental discrepancy. He emphatically underscores the irrationality of Christianity, its ability to tempt the human mind. "Christianity appeared in the world as an incredible doctrine, an incomprehensible deed." But at the same time he tried to justify Christianity with rational proofs, "via a scientific investigation of all the data contained in the experience of the unarguable facts of worldly reality."

All of Nesmelov's deductions have a rationalistic character. He reduced faith itself to the level of common sense: "[Faith] is the acknowledgment of the truth of the reports of those facts that we ourselves did not and cannot observe, but whose probable reality we can nevertheless affirm." In logic he remained on the soil of philosophical empiricism. His whole system has no room for speculation, while there are too many worldly considerations and calculations, too many deductions based on possibility or probability.[246] There is also a kind of missionary oversimplification of the truths themselves. He constantly tries to show that "the apostles were able to teach in such a manner that their teaching set forth the content of the faith of the Church, and they could not have taught otherwise than as the Church now teaches."

Nesmelov strove to make everything in Christianity perfectly clear. "If I can discover why the dogma of the Holy Trinity is affirmed by Christianity, I can discuss the bases of this dogma, and if I see that I cannot but accept those bases, then I already cannot think of God otherwise than as Trinitarian." Acceptance of Christianity, according to Nesmelov, is a certain act of reason, a judicious and prudent act. "The person who finds the justification and clarification of his knowledge in Christianity will necessarily accept Christianity." And if such a unified system of persuasive knowledge would be constructed, then all religious disagreements and arguments would immediately cease, and everyone would accept the true faith. "Man perishes only through his own ignorance"—this is a characteristic utterance for Nesmelov. He wanted to explain to man that there are no obstacles for the mind's acquiring the content of that which is being professed, and that there is every basis for "accepting Christianity as a religion."

Nesmelov's design is quite interesting. He wanted to demonstrate the identity of Christian truth with the ideal of human self-consciousness. Yet psychological analysis, which is always guided by a certain moral pragmatism, was his weakest point. His system is too studied and too schematic; it contains more reasoning than experience or insight.

He claimed that his worldview was built on facts, not ideas. (How characteristic is such a counterposition both for "pragmatism" and "positivism"!) Yet he presented the facts themselves only in outline, without flesh or color. Nesmelov had a striking insensitivity to history. The "man" about whom he spoke does not live in history, but rather alone with his malleable thoughts. When forced to refer to historical facts, Nesmelov would analyze them more than he would present them. He moreover had surprisingly little to say about the Church, and used highly imprecise language when speaking about the sacraments–which he interpreted psychologically (baptism is a "common symbolical sign" of entry into the assembly of those who confess and follow Christ, and so on). He carries his entire scheme too far forward into the future; historical reality is clearly not fully appreciated. In fact, it is underestimated to such a degree that there is no tension between the present and the future. There is no becoming. This world, which is simply not what it should be, must be completely destroyed, and until it is, until a new world is created, the fate of humanity remains undecided.

Nesmelov's system fails precisely as a system. It did pose important questions, but in a very awkward manner. The image of Christ remained pale, concealed precisely by the rational scheme of his act. Nesmelov leaves the problem of the spiritual life practically untouched. His book remains a highly instructive memorial of an age that sought but was still too mistrustful to find. It is quite apparent that the book was written in a quiet corner.

XIV

CONCLUSION

The general contradiction in Russia's development is sharply revealed in the history of Russian theology. Two temperaments–historicism and moralism–diverged and then met once again. This was clearly expressed as far back as the 1850s, when a historical curiosity, a historical receptivity and attentiveness, a love of the past and an ability to return to it with sympathetic imagination was strikingly manifested. The new sensitivity was often combined with a philosophical penetration into history that remained as a legacy of the

romantic period and the "1840s." The historical tendency in Russian theological scholarship was very powerful and prominent. Yet those years also witnessed an irrepressible relapse into "abstract moralism," in which historical insensitivity and even outright hostility merged with the pathos of unconditional necessity. Psychologically, this constituted a rather unexpected return to the eighteenth century, with its "enlightenment" and "sentimentalism." This relapse was quite strongly reflected in Russian theological literature. It achieved a heightening of moral receptivity, albeit sometimes excessively nervous and unhealthy, and also a strengthening of personal interest in religious problematics. The accompanying dangers, however, proved inescapable. Most complex of all was the danger of psychologism, the passing from the stormy expanses of objective reality into the hothouse of the sensitive heart, which represented both the "retirement of reason" in theology and an anguish of vain humility and outright indifference to the truth.

Moralism in Russian theology bore all the marks of a decadent movement. This mood became particularly harmful in the context of the prevailing social and political fears. The very sense of ecclesiasticity softened and decayed in psychological temptations? the mystical reality of the Church became much less obvious and convincing, resulting only in new fears. It was precisely during this ambiguous period that Russia's recent style of ecclesiastical poverty and simplicity took shape. "Moralism"–or "moral monism"–in theology signified a crisis of ecclesiastical culture, a crisis in the very cultural character of the Church. It was somehow asserted–and accepted on faith by too many–that the Church excludes culture, that ecclesiasticity must dwell outside of culture.

Although the most powerful arguments in defense of this scarcely substantiated proposition may have been drawn from the "ascetical" worldview, the full acuteness of this imaginary "uncultured character" of the Church did not lie in the fact that a prohibition was imposed on "secular" culture, but rather in that ecclesiastical culture itself, culture within the Church, was rejected. The "ascetical principle," when applied sensibly and wisely, does not demand this. For all their ascetical self-renunciation, both St. Basil the Great and St. Gregory always remained men of great cultural subtlety, which in them did not constitute a weakness. The same could also be said of many others, such as Maxim the Confessor and John of Damascus, not to mention Origen and Augustine.

With the lowering of the cultural level of the Church, its spiritual and historical influence in Russia was weakened. This represented a crisis and a rupture. Once again we must mention the unhealthy rift

and antagonism between the "white" and the "black" clergy, which became still more deeply ingrained. Ideals and conceptions of the Church actually diverged at the very foundation, and the struggle drove both sides to extremes. Reconciliation and synthesis nearly became a psychological impossibility. Moreover, freedom of discussion was too restricted, while the contradictions and discord were usually camouflaged or skilfully concealed under conditional schemes for reform.

The second half of the nineteenth century cannot at all be described as a time of impotence and decline in the history of Russian theology. A great deal was accomplished during that period, and the tempo of events was rather quick. Yet the time was a troubled, bifurcated, and anxious one. The historian must constantly note contradictions and discrepancies. But it was not a dormant period—on the contrary, it was a time of an exalted excitability.

CHAPTER VIII

ON THE EVE

CHAPTER VIII

ON THE EVE

I

AN END AND A BEGINNING

Fin de siècle Russia represented both an end and a beginning, the apex of awareness, when the very rhythm of life changed. "A feeling for the extraordinary waxed steadily," reported Andrei Belyi.[1] More than just a spiritual quest, it was a new experience. During those years many suddenly discovered in man a metaphysical being; men suddenly found in themselves unexpected depths, and often dark chasms. The world seemed changed, for vision had become sharper and a new profundity has been revealed in the world. A religious need again awakened in Russian society. And just as in the time of Alexander I, it was again painful and difficult. The more the "soul awoke" the more temptation increased, and life took on greater risks.

The religious theme became a theme of life, and not merely a category of thought. People began to seek for more than just a religious worldview—a genuine thirst flared up for faith. A need was born for the "spiritual life" and for preparing and ordering one's soul. Everything suddenly became quite serious. This does not mean that everyone was serious and truly valued the significance of what was transpiring. On the contrary—there was too much of the most dangerous dilettantism, mystical irresponsibility, and mere games. Yet the events themselves became serious and acquired a distinctive and harsh apocalyptical rhythm. Men's fates were being decided. Some were saved, others perished; some were swept from the road and lost; some redeemed their souls and the souls of their brothers. There were many accidents, and hopes were seldom realized. Those who achieved any-

thing at all were outnumbered by the fallen. A few found themselves in the Church, but many more remained, and wished to remain, outside of it. Still others followed serpentine paths and entered upon a bitter trial. "Once more dreams floated, and the soul, captivated by them, worshipped unknown gods." It was a time of searching and temptation. Paths strangely crossed and diverged, contradiction reigned, while the anxiety of the conscience intensified. At the same time an underground revolt was breaking out.

The influences of Tolstoi and Nietzsche equally characterize the 1890s, though Nietzsche's was the stronger. He was understood in various ways. For some he stood as a negation, "a man of the final revolt," who shattered historical morality. For others he was a teacher–a teacher and prophet of a new morality, a "love for that which is beyond."[2] Strangely enough, it was precisely Nietzsche who suggested to many the idea of a religious synthesis and a religious culture.

Kantian motifs–the ideology of imperative and duty, the pathos of moral well-being–were also characteristic of the 1890s. The "return to Kant" first began in Russia in the realm of moral philosophy. Kant, linked with Schopenhauer, was typical even of Vladimir Solov'ev. People were usually attracted by Kant's defense of the independence of moral decisions. This point is demonstrated by the revival of natural law–a phenomenon associated above all with P. I. Novgorodtsev (1866-1924).[3] It was a departure from a one-sided historicism to social philosophy, the politics of law, and the restoration of the right of moral judgment and criticism. Somewhat later the ideas of Windelband and Rickert, the idea of "ethical criticism," achieved wide circulation.[4] Windelband's *Präludien* (usually together with *The Justification of the Good*) was decisive reading for many at that time. The appearance in 1903 of the famous collection of essays, *Problems of Idealism*, which bound together representatives of quite diverse currents of thought, marked the foundation of ethical idealism.[5]

Marxism was the antithesis of this moralistic worldview. The Russians experienced Marxism in the 1890s as a worldview, as a philosophical system. The debate of that time between the "Marxists" and the "populists" was a clash of two philosophical theories or ways of looking at the world, an uprising of a new metaphysics against a domineering moralism. The metaphysics of Marxism was harmful and dogmatic. However, the important thing was Marxism's problematics, not its dogma. No amount of pathos could atone for the metaphysical confusion of the moralists and for their insensitivity. Marxism was, in practice, a return to ontology, to reality, to "being." That same realistic movement can be seen in its very historical determinism. The question

of freedom and necessity in the social process was raised, and it inevitably led to metaphysics.

The transition from Marx to Hegel was very natural, as there was already a Hegelian strain in Marxism.

> Russian Marxism of the 1890s was itself already a crisis in the consciousness of the Russian intelligentsia. It revealed great cultural complications; intellectual and cultural interests awoke which were foreign to the older Russian intelligentsia. This was most evident in the sphere of philosophy.[6]

There began a "return" from Marx to Kant and Hegel and a transition from Marxism to idealism. Gnoseological criticism made dogmatic materialism impossible. Still, those who returned to "idealism" turned to Avenarius or Mach—only to a harmful idealism.[7] In addition to neo-Kantian strains, the influence of immanent philosophy was also felt.[8] There were certain crypto-religious motifs in Marxism: utopian messianism first of all, and then a feeling of social solidarity. As G. P. Fedotov noted, it could be said that it was precisely Marxism that sparked the turnabout in religious seeking in Russia towards Orthodoxy. Bulgakov, Berdiaev, Frank, and Struve all passed through Marxism. These were all symptoms of profound changes. Berdiaev accurately noted that during this period "there appeared souls receptive to all currents of the spirit in Russia." Once again Russian culture experienced a spiritual breaking up of the ice.

A renaissance in Russian poetry occurred in the 1890s. This was not simply a literary or poetical movement, but a new experience; once again poetry and literature took on a special and vital significance. It was a relapse of Russian consciousness into romanticism—the "thirst" for eternity" [*der heisse Durst nach Ewigkeit*] once again blazed.

Everything in the early Russian "symbolist" and "decadent" movements was strangely confused; everything has a double meaning or sense; everything was double. Russian symbolism began in revolt, rejection, and renunciation. The old boring world was denied and denounced. One can sense here the delirium of the "underground man." Contradictory feelings peculiarly succeeded one another: "complete self-assertion," then weariness, indifference, and helpless anguish. Motifs of French symbolism were added to those of Nietzsche. An aspiration to cross the frontier "beyond good and evil," i.e., to overcome ethics with esthetics, is characteristic of the entire movement. This was a new antithesis to the customary morality of the preceding generation. And this typical decadent feature was later to reappear in

the more mature experiments in religious and mystical synthesis. "To say that there are two paths, good and evil, is wrong. There are two paths of good . . . The beauty lies in the fact that it makes no difference which path one takes." (N. M. Minskii)[9] "Evil and good are two paths, but both lead to the same goal, and it doesn't matter which way you are going." (Merezhkovskii)

This was not a "reassessment of values," but the direct subversion of "all values." Mournful and faded tones, "songs of twilight and night," dominate the poetry of the nineties. Yet in this weariness, in this characteristically deep, heavy, creeping anguish, a new depth was being explored. Because too much was said about it at the time it seemed insincere. And there was too much egotism—this sad, grieving consciousness too willingly tore itself away from daily reality and ran off down dark, blind alleys. "My cave is cramped and wet, and there is nothing to warm it with. Far from the terrestrial world, I must die here." (Fedor Sologub)[10] People began to live in a world of shadows, half-tones, and "uncreated creations." Nevertheless, this was a religious longing, a mysterious presentiment, a thirst for faith, a "desire for a spring that has not yet come," for a miracle that has not yet happened. "But the heart wishes and begs for a miracle, a miracle! O, let that which has never been now come to pass." (Zinaida Gippius)[11]

Neither psychologically nor sociologically is it possible to explain such desire or anguish by the disintegration of the bourgeois way of life. One senses here a blind and confused religious anxiety. The fear was genuine—it was fear in the face of chance, fate, destiny, and the blind or dark forces of existence. Such were the characteristic artistic themes "on the frontier of the century." The senselessness and illusions of the world and the frightful desolation and solitude of man were revealed. And there remained yet no escape, but only anguish, agony, and searching. People once again began to read Schopenhauer as a mystical writer, and to his was added the influence of Ibsen and Maeterlinck.[12] Dostoevskii was read and reexperienced above all. Merezhkovskii's book on Tolstoi and Dostoevskii (1902) was written on a recurrent theme, and was more about religion than literature.

The anguish was resolved in foreboding and expectation. "I was recently told in secret that Christ will return soon." At the beginning of the century Andrei Belyi said that "the mists of anguish were suddenly pierced by the red dawn of days that were utterly new." Presentiment reigned; the world appeared transparent. "I was amazed at everything, and on everything I detected a seal." This marked a special return route to faith through esthetics and Nietzsche. But such a faith retained a residue of that esthetics, art, and literary cultivation.

There had already been a return through philosophy to faith (to dogmatism), and through morality (to Evangelicalism). The path through art was new. Vladimir Solov'ev had taken it part way in the 1890s. In addition, there was one more typical feature: the new return to religion occurred through a western inspiration, and was not nourished by eastern or Slavophile sources. "There is no other route to take. The historical road has been traveled. Ahead is a precipice and an abyss, a fall or a chasm. It is the superhistorical road: religion." (Merezhkovskii)

The creative work of Merezhkovskii is most typical of this turn of the century transition from literature to religion. He began with the poetry of sorrow and disillusionment, and with a thirst for faith. From Nietzsche he learned about liberation through beauty, and from Nietzsche he took his basic antithesis: Hellenism and Christianity; the "Olympian" principle and the "Galilean"; the "sanctity of the flesh" and the "sanctity of the spirit." Merezhkovskii had a morbid attachment to logical schemes, and even more to antinomies. But rather than dialectical antitheses, these were esthetic contrasts, which do not submit to resolution in a synthesis. One should recall here Berdiaev's perceptive remark: "Merezhkovskii's secret is the secret of divided thought." Merezhkovskii built his entire worldview upon this opposition of Greece and Christ. Greece was for him a revelation and a liberation.

> I gave one glance and immediately saw everything, I understood the cliffs of the Acropolis and the Parthenon, the Propylaea, and I felt something that I shall bear within me until the day I die. The joy of that great liberation from life given by beauty burst into my soul.

Greece is beauty, but more than a living beauty, it is the beauty of art: "the white marble body of Greece." Liberation from life comes as the "sweet repose of death." Yet the whiteness of the marble and the blue of the southern sea do have their charms, and against this radiant background the "black, colorless shadows of the monk" seemed ominous.

Christianity for Merezhkovskii was precisely monasticism, asceticism, rejection and hatred of the world. In short, it was a deep and heavy shadow. Christianity represented the overabundance of the spirit, just as Hellenism stood for the overabundance of the flesh. In his historical novels he tried to have his characters express this contrast. But here one immediately notices the artificiality of his design. In the fourth century, of course, the Church possessed all the power of life,

while Hellenism was inwardly dying. However, these decadent people of a dying antiquity fascinated him, for they reminded him so much of his contemporaries, all those refined and solitary esthetes, sophists, and gnostics. They were people of a decline, not a renaissance.

Merezhkovskii went even further. To his theme he added a synthesis. How could these "two abysses," the higher and the lower, the spirit and the flesh, be combined? How could the ascetic narrowness of "historical Christianity" be overcome? There was an obvious dualism in this conception. Merezhkovskii was correct in saying that Christianity consecrates the flesh, for it is the religion of the incarnation and the resurrection. Asceticism, therefore, is only one path. But he wished to reunite and sanctify all the ecstasies and passions of the untransfigured flesh. A synthesis would have been possible only in transfiguration, but such transformation and spiritualization of the flesh was exactly what he did not want. Spirit and flesh "are not fused, but interwoven." The result is a deceptive mixture, a seductive flame, a temptation. Merezhkovskii was aware of this danger and hoped to avoid it.

> I know that in my question there is hidden the danger of heresy, which might be called–in opposition to asceticism–the heresy of Astartism, i.e., not of a holy union, but of a blasphemous mingling and polluting of the spirit with the flesh. If that is so, let me be warned by the guards on watch, for, I repeat, I am not teaching, but learning; I do not hear confessions, but make my own. I do not want heresy, and I do not want schism.

Merezhkovskii hardly succeeded in avoiding this "mingling," this tempting ambiguity.

"Historical Christianity," in any event, was never "fleshless," as is required by Merezhkovskii's artificial antinomial scheme. He was completely converted to the Kingdom to Come, to the Third Testament. He foresaw a "great cosmic revolution" half-way to the second coming. "Historical Christianity" is finished, and is the epoch of the Western Church also not over? The "breaking away from paganism"–the historical task of the West–has been fulfilled. Is it not the turn of the Eastern Church now? "Will it not be called to some great act in which, perhaps, there will be contained some still undisclosed word of the Lord on the Holy Spirit and the Holy Flesh?" At the time, however, Merezhkovskii did not wish to abandon the "historical" Church, for he believed in its creative possibilities. This belief led to meetings with "churchmen" in the "Religious-Philosophical Meetings" held

in St. Petersburg from 1901 to 1903.[13] He talked about a "Christian Renaissance" as a counterweight to the overly pagan Renaissance, and he asked whether this renaissance had not already begun in Russian literature and whether a religious return must not begin in literature. He also asked if this renaissance would not be a mere revival of paganism instead of a rediscovery of Christianity. All the same, he was closer to Nietzsche and Goethe than to Dante or St. Francis of Assisi. Merezhkovskii simply did not know "historical Christianity," and all of his schemes turned out extremely transparent. They were precisely schemes, and not an intuitive understanding.

Merezhkovskii also had a second and special theme concerning Russia: the theme of the Petrine reform. "Never in the history of the world has there been such a cataclysm, such an upheaval in the human conscience, as Russia experienced during Peter's reforms. It was not only the Old Believers who were reminded of the Antichrist." From here it was a short step to that religious justification of revolution, so characteristic of Merezhkovskii's later development. He lived wholly in expectation of the second coming. Would not Orthodoxy, as freedom and through love, reconcile Catholicism and Protestantism, faith and reason, "as one catholic and apostolic and genuinely universal Church of the Holy Sophia, the Wisdom of God, whose head and pontiff is Jesus Christ himself"? Merezhkovskii possessed schemes rather than experiences, but in these schemes he often captured and reinforced typical and prevailing moods.

Merezhkovskii was the first in Russia to formulate the theme of Christianity and Hellenism, but it was not his personal theme. Viacheslav Ivanov (1866-1949) later posed the same question and developed it with more penetration.[14]

Ivanov's path somehow led around Christianity, although in his later years it curved back and served as his passageway to the Roman Church. Ivanov was entirely immersed in antiquity and art. He came to Christianity from the cult of Dionysius, from the ancient "Hellenic religion of the suffering god," which he had studied for many long years as more than just a historian or archeologist. He reinterpreted Christianity in the spirit of Bacchus and orgiasm; he created a new myth. His scheme was more esthetic than religious, as his religious thirst was sated by his esthetic falsifications.

Viacheslav Ivanov's primary vision was *sobornost'* and catholic action. He wished to religiously assimilate the problem of the "people" and the "collective," yet he always remained a solitary dreamer, too absorbed in his poetic ecstasies. Genuine "catholicity" is not the mystery of some mystical collective, but the revelation of the one

Christ, in whom all are one, each being with him. Such was also the chief danger of "symbolism," that religion is transformed into art, almost into a game, and its devotees hoped to break into spiritual reality by an assault of poetic inspiration, avoiding the labor of prayer. There were too many dreams and too little sobriety. Ivanov's truth lies in the fact that he had a genuine feeling for the religious reality and significance of history. This was demonstrated with particular clarity in his famous polemic with M. O. Gershenzon, in their remarkable *Corner-to-Corner Correspondence* [*Perepiska iz dvukh uglov*, Petrograd, 1921]. It was entirely the same typical Russian polemic about historicism and moralism in a new form. Ivanov maintained the religious meaning of history against moralistic nihilism.

Under the combined influences of Merezhkovskii and Ivanov, the theme of a dual religious rebirth was again posed most energetically by N. A. Berdiaev.

> We are captivated not only by Golgotha, but by Olympus as well. We are summoned and drawn not only by the suffering God who died on the cross but also by the god Pan, the god of earthly elements, the god of the joys of life; and also by the ancient goddess Aphrodite, the goddess of plastic beauty and earthly love . . . And we bow in reverence not only before the cross, but also before the divinely beautiful body of Venus.[15]

The seductively alluring idea of weaving together the two abysses could not have been more powerfully expressed. Christianity is an "incomplete truth," for it is fleshless and ascetic. "The crimes of the Church against the earth, against the truth of the earth, against culture and freedom, are too terrible, too unendurable." For Berdiaev himself such moods only represented a passing stage, but they typified the period. It was an outburst of a dark and very passionate naturalism. These dreams of a sinful imagination arrested and captivated the Russian soul during its return to the Church.

The temptation of religious naturalism was expressed even more sharply and keenly in the creative work and worldview of V. V. Rozanov (1856-1919). He was a writer of great religious temperament, but he was religiously blind–not to religion, but in religion. Rozanov was a man of religious passion, not thought, nor even faith. His dreadful lack of feeling was more astounding than even his insight. The fact is that he could not even see the obvious. In a peculiarly awful way Rozanov not only failed to see Christianity, he also failed to hear the

Good News. He heard only what he wished to hear, what he was willing to hear. He interpreted everything in his own way. Rozanov himself even admitted that from childhood he was "swallowed up by his imagination." Everything for him was only a bridle. He had no center. His life was a chaos of fleeting moments, episodes, and flashes. All of his books read like a diary. His most characteristic writings were aphorisms, short phrases, fragments, and scraps. Rarely was he able to paint on a larger canvass. He had a dislocated and dislocating consciousness–dislocating because it was capricious and destructive in details and trifles. All of a sudden some irritating associations (irritating probably because of their juxtaposition) would flash before him. "I was never able to concentrate . . . Some thought or subject was always pricking me." At the bottom he concealed a defective willpower, for he had no sense of responsibility for his thoughts, no desire to be held accountable for them. He was sustained by his thoughts, but he did not master them. He reached the limit of subjectivism and romantic capriciousness. Rozanov wrote his later works with an importunate and unnecessary intimacy that became mannered and careless.

Rozanov's outlook was shaped by his own personal sorrows and humiliations. Beginning with the Hegelianism of his early years, he remained receptive to widely varying intellectual currents.[16] He read through Dostoevskii (and Gogol) and assimilated in part (but only in part) the ideology of *pochvennichestvo*. Leont'ev made a more powerful impression, and Rozanov wrote a very penetrating essay about him while he was still alive. In that essay one can detect the characteristic style of Rozanov's later thought and themes. Most typical of all was his "Esthetic Understanding of History" (the title of the first of the essays written in 1892). All other standards were abolished for the sake of the esthetic. The motifs of romantic naturalism, such as the charms of the primitive cults of the ancient East, always worked powerfully on him. To all this he rather unexpectedly added an extreme sentimentalism of philistine emotions. He rejected dogma for the sake of tender feelings. "Christianity arose from the sighs of the people, from the feelings of the people for God." God is the "center of world feeling."

Rozanov's acute psychologism, which destroys the very reality of religious experience, was not accidental. "What is he for me? My eternal sorrow and my joy, a special joy, unconnected with anything . . ." The last chapters of the Gospel seemed unreal and unconvincing to him, for they lead people astray. From such a psychological perspective the good news of Christianity could not be seen. Rozanov's religion can hardly be termed the religion of Bethlehem. The true mystery of Bethlehem is the fiery mystery of the divine incarnation,

not Rozanov's pastoral scene or picture of family devotion. The joy is not so much that of human birth, but rather of the glory of God's condescension. The Word became flesh! Rozanov could never understand this. He did not understand Bethlehem or accept the mystery of Godmanhood with either his mind or his heart, which explains his hostility towards, and revolt against, the cross. "Christianity is a culture of funerals." He thus remained entirely outside of Christianity and condemned it from without, as an outsider.

Rozanov's naturalism cannot be called "Christian." After all, is Christian naturalism even possible? Rozanov accepts the world as it has been given—not because it already has been saved, but because it has no particular need of salvation. Existence itself is exceedingly pleasant. Such is his "raw substance of earth." The untransfigured world is so dear to him that for its sake he rejects Jesus—for, beside the sweetness of Jesus, the world is rancid. Pagan joy and primitive life are equally impossible in Christianity. This is why Rozanov considered Christianity mortifying and reached the point of *The Dark Face* [*Temnyi Lik*, the title of his book published in 1911].

Rozanov's blindness is striking—whether it is in his essays on "a-dogmatic Christianity" delivered at the Religious-Philosophical Meetings (1902), in his later essay "Sweet Jesus and the Bitter Fruits of the World" (1907), or in *The Dark Face*. After this last book came out Rozanov began to suspect something (in connection with the inevitability of death), but he still remained blind. And yet, in his *Apocalypse of Our Times*, published just before his death, he retained his earlier hostility. He called Christianity "nihilism," because Christ "did not accept" the royal power offered to him during the temptation in the wilderness. Nonetheless, Rozanov died as a member of the Church.

Rozanov had an unquestionable feeling for life, for its banality and trivialities. Berdiaev aptly called him "an ingenious man in the street." But his was a decadent feeling for life, and not for simple ordinary life. He had a love affair with existence, which derived from a spiritual lack of customary life. The vision of flesh and sex with which Rozanov was undoubtedly endowed was also diseased and unhealthy, for he was incapable of seeing the whole, integral man. For him man was split into spirit and flesh, and only the flesh was ontologically convincing. "We rename the holy land, the sacred root of existence, the land of the Karamazovs."

Rozanov deserted the New Testament for the Old, but he understood the Old Testament also in his own selective and whimsical way. In the Bible he found only legends about families and births and a

song of passion and love. He read the Old Testament not with biblical eyes, but rather with the eyes of an eastern pagan or servant of some orgiastic cult. He religiously opposed Christianity, and his anti-Christianity proved to be an entirely different religion. He religiously retreated to pre-Christian cults and reverted to primitive worship and lamentations; he withdrew into fertility cults. As in the case of the Gospels, Rozanov failed to hear what was actually fundamental and central to the Old Testament revelation. He understood blood sacrifice, for "blood is mysticism and a fact." But he did not understand the "sacrifice of a contrite spirit to God," and he lamented that an idea had been substituted for a "fact"! In vain he bemoaned the fact that the "existence of dogma stifled the possibility of prophecy." To be sure, no prophecies sounded for him.

Rozanov is a seductive and passionate psychological riddle. He was a man hypnotized by the flesh and lost in biological experiences and desires. The riddle contained something typical. Rozanov could impress, captivate, and lure others, but he was bereft of positive ideas. He belonged to the older generation. During the 1890s he wrote for the *Russian Messenger* [*Russkii vestnik*],[17] and in St. Petersburg he joined the circle of the newest generation of Slavophiles: N.P. Aksakov, S.F. Sharapov, A. Vasil'ev, and N.N. Strakhov.[18] He drew close to the "symbolists" very late, at the beginning of the present century, but he and the symbolists soon found common themes: the theme of the flesh, *la rehabilitation de la chair,* and the argument against asceticism.

The separate byways on which the Russian intelligentsia returned, if not to faith, then at least to religious themes, during the 1890s, were randomly entwined and woven into a dense thicket. Yet this same era marks the beginning of the inner return to religious roots and sources in Russian culture. The despair ceased. The first years of the new century were played out in a new key: "The sun dawned and blinded our eyes." (Andrei Belyi)

II

THE SEDUCTIVE PATH OF VLADIMIR SOLOV'EV

Vladimir Solov'ev's path was a common one. The 1890s were years of disillusionment. Solov'ev's French book on the union of the Churches met with no success in Catholic circles, and the collapse

of his theocratic project he took badly. His design proved unrealizable. Still, he did not change his views on the reunion of the Churches, as is fully evident from his subsequent letters to Eugene Tavernier.[19] In those letters he developed his apocalyptical scheme. As the Bible had predicted, the majority of the people take the side of the Antichrist, while a tiny minority of true believers remains. The believers will be persecuted, but in the end will triumph. Hence, it was now clearly necessary to "abandon the idea of any formal greatness or power in theocracy ['abandonner l'idée de la puissance et de la grandeur extérieure de théocratie'] in the arena of the direct and immediate construction of Christian politics." This did not mean passivity. The struggle against the Antichrist demands cooperation. But it is necessary now to strive for truth, and glory will come later. Above all, moral and religious unity must be restored on the basis of law, not on the basis of arbitrarines–*une base légitime et traditionelle*. And for Solov'ev there is only one lawful center of unity in this world: Rome, "eternal Rome."

Solov'ev admits that the majority of the people will be on the side of the Antichrist. But what can be done about it? One must be filled with the spirit of Christ, in order to be fully aware if any given activity or undertaking is in genuine cooperation with Jesus Christ. The Word of God predicts the universal preaching of the Gospel before the end of the world. This does not mean merely the outward extension of Christianity. Christian doctrine must be expounded with such fulness that each person is able to accept it or reject it with complete understanding and responsibility. In other words, the first necessary step is the "universal reconstruction of Christian philosphy," and *instauratio magna* (this was written in the summer of 1896).

Solov'ev completely abandoned the "mechanical designs" of his "theocratic period," yet he remained faithful to "eternal Rome." This is why he could approach the sacraments of the Roman Church. However, his disillusionment was deeper than is usually imagined. For a while he entirely avoided church topics. The only exception was his famous essay *On the Collapse of the Medieval Worldview* [*Ob upadke srednevekovago mirovozzreniia,* 1891]. He now occupied himself with the philosophy of art, journalism, and completely accidental subjects. He proceeded from moral philosophy to theocratic philosophy, and finally began to translate Plato. In his last years, however, he returned to work on the Bible. He joined the "skeptics of the Neva," contributed to the *European Messenger,* and argued bitterly with the Slavophile epigones.[20]

Solov'ev somehow internally left the Church. It was precisely at that time that he addressed to Rozanov that unexpected phrase about the religion of the Holy Spirit: "The religion of the Holy Spirit, which I confess, is broader and more substantial than all the separate religions. It is neither their sum, nor an extract of them–just as the whole man is neither the sum nor the extract of his separate organs."[21] "His mystical life took place outside of the Church," remarked one biographer. "By shedding the bonds of the Church, Solov'ev fell victim to his own mystical freedom and was carried away by a whirlwind of magic." (S.M. Solov'ev)[22]

The early 1890s found Solov'ev in a state of a most unhealthy erotic excitement, passionate theosophical love, and "spiritual fainting." His famous essays on the *Meaning of Love* (1892-1894) were based on these experiences. This represented a dreadful occult plan for the union of humanity with God through heterosexual love. According to Solov'ev, the meaning of love was to see the "idea" in the loved one, but the idea itself is only the image of a "universal essence" or eternal femininity.

> Here, the idealization of a lesser being is at the same time the first step toward a higher one. Such is the truth of the pathos of love. The full realization, the metamorphosis of individual feminine being into something inseparable from the source of the rays of eternal, divine femininity, will be the actual and objective, not merely the subjective, reunion of the individual with God, through the renewal of the living, immortal image of God in man.

Solov'ev stresses that such love is the "inescapable condition of man's actually residing in truth." In his conception, it cannot be otherwise possible.

God has his other from all eternity in the image of eternal femininity, but he wishes this image to become actual and incarnate in each individual being.

> The eternal feminine principle–which is not a passive image in the mind of God, but a living spiritual being, commanding power and activity with complete authority–itself also strives for such a realization and incarnation. The entire worldly and historical process is the process of her realization and incarnation in a great diversity of forms and degrees. . . . The heavenly object of our love is singular, always and for everyone the same, the eternal feminity of God.

A few years later, in an essay on the poetry of Ia. P. Polonskii,[23] Solov'ev repeats: "Happy is the poet who has not lost his faith in the feminine Shadow of the Divinity, who has not betrayed the eternally young Tsar-Virgin. She will never betray him and will preserve his youthfulness of heart both in his early and in his later years." Here we are granted a few distressing glimpses into Solov'ev's mystical experience. Rozanov had reason to remark that Solov'ev had a "romance with God."

There is an obvious connection between this erotic project and the ideas of N. F. Fedorov. Death is the inevitable consequence of animal reproduction, which Solov'ev regarded with unconcealed aversion. Thus arose the task of restoring the fulness of the human race. "The power of this spiritual-physical creativity in man consists of simply redirecting or turning inward that same creative power that in nature produces a useless eternity of physical reproductions of organisms, as it is concerned only with the external world."

Solov'ev's lyric poetry of these years reflects that same erotic and magical displacement. This was particularly true of the poems of his Finnish cycle. "All of the poetry and philosophy produced on the banks of Lake Saima was begotten by Swedenborgian theosophy." (S.M. Solov'ev) Even in the *Justification of the Good* this somber romantic-erotic thread is woven into the fabric of a moral system. The entire chapter on shame (or conscience, for according to Solov'ev the original source of the conscience is shame) was built on the conviction that birth is the road to death. The blind forces of nature and life draw man into a series of dying generations that succeed one another.

Man inwardly and ideally opposes such a process, for he does not wish to submit to this natural law of succeeding generations. But man must actively oppose this law; he must abstain through asceticism from giving birth–for the act of giving birth only represents an affirmation of man's willingness to follow the "blind course of nature, a course whose very blindness is shameful, for it is merciless to the departing generations; it is dishonorable, for they are the generations of our fathers." The only positive moment that Solov'ev allows in marriage is the moment of falling in love. "By concentrating the power of our lives on the production of children we reject our fathers, for whom there is nothing left but to die." This comes directly from Fedorov.

The Kingdom of God as an "actual moral world order is a universal assembly, a world-wide resurrection and restoration of all men."

Such is the goal, and asceticism, i.e., "the spiritual mastery of the flesh," is the means. Asceticism is a duty to our ancestors.

> Even though our ancestors are eternally remembered by God and rest with the saints, the potentiality of their lives is conditioned by the actions of their descendants, who create on earth the necessary conditions for bringing about the end of the world process. Consequently, there is a physical resurrection of the dead, in which each of the departed is, in an ultimate way, naturally bound with future humanity through the uninterrupted bloodline of one's family.

The task is equivalent to personal asceticism. The general point is precisely "man's positive duty to free material nature from the necessity of decay and death and prepare it for a universal physical resurrection."

The 1890s witnessed a notable increase in active magical motifs in Solov'ev's creative work, marking the beginning of an inner struggle. Solov'ev returned in part to ecclesiastical topics, as in his *Easter Letters* [*Paskhal'nyiia pis'ma,* 1898]. Then an apocalyptical theme emerged. He began to feel an apocalyptical anxiety, in which one can sense the depth of his personal anguish. It was not only personal disillusionment ("universal history has come to an end"), but precisely a mystical terror. He came to understand the temptation of evil in a new light, which became a new motif for him. He spoke not only of the "failures of Christ's work" on earth but also about outright acts of treason and falsification. The image of the Antichrist rose insistently before him. In former times Solov'ev loved to remind people that unbelievers often accomplish works of faith and love, and in this way the entire history of the secularization of culture found justification for him. But now he stressed the seductive ambiguity of such culture. The Antichrist, the "new ruler of the world," will be a great spiritual figure, a philanthropist, and even a philosopher—"a man of impeccable refinement and uncommon genius." Characteristically, temptations will arise and proceed through this imaginary natural "goodness" and genius. This insight, together with his belief that the "reunion" of all Christians will take place far beyond the bounds of history, in the *eschaton*, gives poignancy to Solov'ev's vision.

One more highly personal feature must be mentioned. In *The Open Road to Universal Peace and Prosperity*, Solov'ev's book on the Antichrist, one cannot fail to be struck by his deliberate remark

about his former dreams of the "great synthesis." "This will be something all-embracing and will reconcile all contradictions." There is only one flaw: all Christian "values" will be included, but not Christ himself. In *The Tale of the Antichrist* Solov'ev renounces the illusions and the seductions of his whole life, comdemning them with all his might. "I wrote this book to give final expression to my views on the problem of the Church." This could not but be his last work. One senses in this book all the sorrow and tragedy of a personal defeat and renunciation.

For his contemporaries Solov'ev was first and foremost a philosopher: a religious idealist, the confessor and prophet of a definite worldview. For the younger generation he was a mystic and a poet. The latter were more interested in his experiences than in his views. In his *Memories of Blok*, Andrei Belyi describes the intimate gatherings at the house of M. S. Solov'ev, the philosopher's younger brother. Most of the interest was centered precisely on his mysticism. "In 1901 we lived in the atmosphere of his poetry, as the theurgical conclusion to his teaching about Sophia-Wisdom." They strove to grasp the connection between his erotic lyrics and his theosophy. "Solov'ev's book *The Meaning of Love* best explains the quest to realize Solov'evism as a way of life." Belyi compares Solov'ev's doctrine to the "lyrical philosophy" of Valentinus, whom Solov'ev greatly esteemed.[24] "By uniting the wisdom of the gnostics with the hymns of the poets, Vladimir Solov'ev spoke a new word about the imminent coming and appearance before our eyes of the Eternal Woman."[25]

At that same time Aleksandr Blok began to sing his own songs about the "Beautiful Lady." "The keen mystical and romantic experiences in Vladimir Solov'ev's poetry captured my whole being." Blok's poetry is a unique commentary on the poetry and mysticism of Solov'ev. As Belyi aptly remarked,

> A. A. Blok was the first among us to reveal the design of Vladimir Solov'ev's lyric poetry, when he recognized the immensity of its philosophical meaning. He also carried "Solov'evism" to an extreme, nearly making a "sect" out of it. Even if it was subsequently said that this marked the extreme point of Solov'ev's despair and his unhealthy erotic roots. . . nevertheless, Blok revealed himself in Solov'ev, and without this revelation much in Solov'ev would have remained unintelligible–for example, the themes of the *Third Testament* and the *Confession* of A. N. Shmidt.[26]

Anna Shmidt considered herself the incarnation of Sophia, and in her *Third Testament* she developed a very complicated system of gnostic teachings.[27] In the last year of Solov'ev's life she tried to arrange a personal meeting with him, and actually did meet him, causing him great embarrassment with the resoluteness of her professions. She maintained that Solov'ev was the second incarnation of the Logos. In anxiety Solov'ev replied: "Your confession arouses the greatest pity, and sorrowfully intercedes on your behalf before the Almighty. It is all right that you once wrote such a confession, but I beg of you to return to this subject no more. . . . Please, do not talk about me to anyone. It would be better if you spent all of your free moments praying to God."

After Solov'ev's death, Shmidt turned up with Blok both in the countryside and in the editorial offices of the *New Way* [*Novyi put'*].[28] Georgii Chulkov,[29] then secretary of the editorial board, recalls that:

> She appeared as a living warning to all who would travel Solov'ev's path. . . . Around "Eternal Femininity" arose mirages that could addle weak and strong minds alike. The "exalted" turned out at times to be a "bottomless pit." The old woman Shmidt, believing with insane sincerity that she was the incarnation of Sophia and confronting Solov'ev with this strange news just before his death, stood as a retribution to the mystic, who had dared the risk and terror of affirming a new dogma. I now [1922] have the opportunity of studying several of Vladimir Solov'ev's previously unpublished manuscripts, which were written in a special type of notation that the poet-philosopher devised automatically during a trance. Such trances, in which Solov'ev served as a medium from time to time, were characteristic of him. The theme of his notes is always "Sophia"–but whether she is real or imaginary is another question. In any event, the character of these notes is such that there is no doubt about the "demonism" experienced by those who would share the spiritual experiment of this worshiper of the Virgin of the Rainbow Gates.

Blok's experience likewise testifies to the dangers of Solov'ev's path. One cannot, of course, equate Blok's experience with Solov'ev's, but Blok did proceed from Solov'ev. He isolated various of Solov'ev's

themes and thereby made all their weak points particularly obvious. This was particularly true for Solov'ev's cosmic themes. "I await the universal life of a vernal world." Such an expectation was taken out of its Christian context, although the epigraph from the Apocalypse was retained: "The Spirit and the Bride say, 'Come.' " (Revelations 22:17.

Blok, unlike Solov'ev, was not at all a rationalist, and in his alogical lyricism he remained totally under the influences of the impressions he was experiencing at the time. He was all attention and hearing and a medium through and through. S.M. Solov'ev tried to define the differences in the following way: "Vladimir Solov'ev chose ascetic effort and mystical knowledge; Blok preferred lyrical-chaotic freedom." As Blok himself said in 1906, "Mysticism is the Bohemia of the soul; religion is standing on guard." Blok never mastered his lyrical emotions and allowed himself to be driven by their tempest from "standing on guard" to orgies of "snowy nights." Hence the gloomy despair of his last poems. But such distinctions are only partly true, for Solov'ev's asceticism must not be exaggerated. "There really was no actual asceticism," Blok remarked. The question revolves around who Solov'ev saw and who he encountered in his mystical experiences.

The most surprising thing about Blok's experience is his irreligion; his mysticism was by no means religious. It lacked faith, and was totally devoid of God. Although he read Solov'ev's books, Blok had no interest in his theological views. He simply did not feel the historical reality of the Church. In some strange way he remained entirely outside of Christianity. Perhaps because he was seized and restrained by his own experience, the face of Christ was hidden from his sight by the face of Sophia. Andrei Belyi maintained that " 'She' was more significant for Blok than Christ, and also nearer to him." Blok was absorbed in the cosmic experience, "But I fear–you will change your form." This foreboding came to pass, for the "form" was plastic and multifaceted.

Blok's experience consisted of his mystical romance. As is required by Vladimir Solov'ev's theory in *The Meaning of Love*, he achieved awareness through falling in love. "This romance possessed all of the characteristics peculiar to a religious act. In essence it was sacred and liturgical. Blok spoke, felt, and thought like one ordained." (P. Medvedev)[30] Yet was such an "act" not a despairing zeal? And were not features of a blasphemous parody openly apparent in the lyrical confessions of this "act"? "The image of this hypothetical lady began to merge and become confused with a clearly etched image of a harlot."

(Viacheslav Ivanov) This merging was simply the result of dividing a seductive image that had seemed indivisible–the original ambiguity was revealed. "You went off to the fields, never to return." This was the inevitable ruin of his experiment without grace. "But let it go. The raptures of a voracious life once again drive me insanely on in blindness and intoxication, in gloom and anxiety."

Blok's downfall may be compared with the fate of Vrubel.[31] He shared the same mystery and the same motif about the same temptation: "demonism" in art (the "violet worlds"). Can artistic intuition penetrate the spiritual world? Is there any reliable criterion for "testing the spirits"? Precisely at this point comes the downfall of romanticism, for there is no objective criterion: artistic vision cannot replace faith. Neither meditation nor rapture can be substituted for religious experience. Everything inevitably begins to dissipate and meander. Such is the path "from Novalis to Heine."[32] "Free theurgy" turns out to be a false and suicidal path. Blok knew that he was walking on the brink of the demonic. In 1916 he read the first volume of the Russian *Philokalia,* making notes in the margins. About the "spirit of sorrow" he wrote, "Such a demon is necessary for the artist." It was certainly his own demon.

Solov'ev claimed to be not only a philosopher but also a "theurgist." He dreamed of a "religious act," and a religious act through art. Solov'ev must be judged not only on the basis of his philosophy but also on the merits of his religious life. After all, it is impossible to be a Christian solely by one's worldview. The development of Solov'evian themes by Blok and others serves as an immanent critique (and exposure) of his experiment, and calls into question all "religion of romanticism," religious estheticism, or esthetic religion. Temptation yields to seduction. Sometimes it does not yield, but is conquered. Some enter the Church not to pray but to dream. And the religious life of those among the Russian intelligentsia who returned to the Church was stricken and poisoned by this temptation.

The entire significance of the "beginning of the century" was in the transition from "religious thought" to "religious life." The need for asceticism was more acute than ever. "He who passed from religious thought to religious life had to kindle a lamp before the icon and fall down on his knees in prayer," as Berdiaev wrote in 1910. Delay was much more dangerous now, for new searchings were being taken up as a quest, and people were becoming lost.

III

THE ST. PETERSBURG RELIGIOUS-PHILOSOPHICAL MEETINGS

The St. Petersburg Religious-Philosophical Meetings of 1901-1903 were an absolutely exceptional event in the history of Russian society. Merezhkovskii relates his impressions of these meetings in the following words: "As if the walls of the room had been pushed apart to reveal infinite distances, this small gathering became like an ecumenical council. Speeches were delivered like prayers and prophecies. In the fiery atmosphere that was generated everything seemed possible. A miracle might take place at any moment—the barriers separating people might dissolve, disintegrate, and unity might arise; the children might find their mother." Of course, this was not the first time that the "historical Church" had encountered the secular world and culture, even in Russia. But this new encounter—the meeting of the intelligentsia and the Church after the stormy experience of nihilism, renunciation, and oblivion—marked a triumph over the "sixties." It was a return to faith.

The design of the "meetings" was inevitably two-sided; each side understood the goal quite differently. The "ecclesiastical authorities" permitted the meetings from a sense of mission. The intelligentsia expected a new action, new revelations, and a new testament from the Church. Apocalyptical motifs resounded at nearly every meeting. "We are standing on the edge of history," said V.A. Ternavtsev.[33] In Rozanov's words, "We are trying to believe, but let them start doing something and everything will end favorably." Such expectations were unjustified. The meetings quickly became fashionable, but had no practical results and were halted by official ban. "The union of the Church and the world did not take place," remarked Merezhkovskii.

However, one cannot say that the meetings failed. The encounter for which they were conceived did take place, and that encounter constitutes their historical importance. Merezhkovskii himself said of the churchmen and hierarchs: "With an open heart, with deep simplicity and humility, and with a holy desire to understand and help, they came to meet the world, to 'seek out the fallen.' They did all they could." The chairman of the meetings was Sergii (Stragorodskii), then rector of the St. Petersburg Academy, and his influence was decisive. "That pastor's spirit rested upon the flock and determined

the happy and totally unexpected success of the gatherings. By his spirit he showed how one should behave: not to look out for oneself, but to watch over others. Vanity and egoism died while a living stream of spiritual interests sprang up. Everyone wanted to listen instead of speak." In all there were twenty-two meetings, beginning in November 1901 and ending in March 1903. The *Protocols* [*Zapiski*] of the meetings were authorized for publication in the journal *New Way* [*Novyi put'*], but after the protocols of twenty meetings were published the printing was stopped. Those protocols that had been published were collected in a separate volume in 1906. In spite of reworking by the censor, these *Protocols* constitute a historical document of rare value, from which the very setting and style of the gatherings can be recaptured.

Behind all of the disputes and discussions stood one fundamental and crucial question: How could Christianity again become influential in life? This question contained the entire meaning of the religious searching. In this regard, the first lecture of the meetings–V. A. Ternavtsev's "The Russian Church in the face of a Great Task"–was characteristic of all of them.

> The time has come for all of Christianity to demonstrate not just in doctrinal word but in deed that the Church embodies more than a beyond-the-grave ideal. The time has come to reveal the truth about the world concealed in Christianity–the teaching and preaching of the Christian state. The time has come to witness to the religious vocation of the secular powers and our common salvation in Christ.

Strictly speaking, this was Vladimir Solov'ev's theme, only stated more emphatically. While proclaiming heaven, the Church does not neglect the earth. The intelligentsia is entirely engaged in worldly social service, and the Church must religiously justify and sanction this service. Solov'ev had already spoken of Christian actions by unbelievers. Now, in his spirit, Ternavtsev spoke of the imminent "religious regeneration in the official self-consciousness of the authorities." People must become aware of the tragedy of power.

> The time has come when the question of Christ becomes for the state a question of life and death, a source of either infinite hope or infinite terror. Responsibility for evil, the godlessness of life, and social ruin direct the conscience of the state to those inner experiences that are capable of

> sustaining the deepest religious-sacramental meaning. A certain sacred magic is revealed in authority. This is something new in Christianity, and in it lies the path of religious creativity for Russia as well as the revelation of universal salvation. It is given to mankind once in a millenium.

Ternavtsev emphasized that "it can be considered an accomplished fact that to preach in Russia means to preach to the whole world."

Apocalyptical tension, a new trait in Ternavtsev, was a sign of the times. It also appeared in Solov'ev during his last years. (Compare this with the keen interest in the Apocalypse displayed by Lev Tikhomirov and his circle.)[34] "I believe in a new Revelation; I await it," said Ternavtsev. "Faith in the holy land promised by God through his prophets–such is the secret soon to be revealed." This revelation about the world is also a new revelation about man. "The strict limits of individuality in which every sould is now confined will fall away. The earth, with the heavens opened above it, will become the arena of a new, suprahistorical life. This is the way to true freedom of the human conscience." Humanism has collapsed–a new and more biblical anthropology must now be constructed. "The supremely authoritative Orthodox Russian East and sacerdotal Roman Catholicism are the twin summits upon which the lightning of the New Revelation will first strike." This is again from Solov'ev.

This theme of religious community was typical of all of the meetings. Several reports were delivered on contemporary topics: Merezhkovskii on the excommunication of Tolstoi; Prince S. M. Volkonskii on freedom of conscience.[35] Merezhkovskii also spoke on Tolstoi and Dostoevskii, and Gogol and Father Matvei. The same question of the relationship of the Church to the world was always raised. Five sessions were devoted to the subject of marriage, usually in connection with the views of Rozanov and the general theory of "sacred flesh." Then the question of dogmatic development was discussed. The two final sessions (before the meetings were banned) dealt with the priesthood. (The protocols of these last two meetings were not published.)

The debates on "dogmatic development" were particularly characteristic. But what was under discussion was more the possibility of a "New Revelation," or revelations, and the new directions in Christian creativity and culture, rather than the "development of dogmas" in the strict sense of the term. In the program of the meetings it was asked:

> Can we consider the dogmatic teaching of the Church to be completed? (The relationship between dogma and revelation.) Have the revelations of Christianity been realized in the reality of European humanity (in the state, family, culture, art, and science)? If further religious creativity in Christianity is possible and necessary, what are the actual ways to achieve it? How can such creativity be reconciled with the Holy Scriptures, the tradition of the Church, the canons of the ecumenical councils, and the teachings of the Holy Fathers?.

This discussion was launched with the address of Professor P. I. Leporskii, who simply answered all questions negatively.[36] Neither a "numerical multiplication of dogmas" nor a deeper apprehension of the mystery they contain was possible. "Dogmatics only certify fact." In any event, Leporskii's answer was very unsuccessful and careless. He exaggerated the incomprehensibility of revelation, leaving an aftertaste of an unexpected agnosticism. Professor A. I. brilliantov immediately pointed this out.[37] "To insist on the unfathomability of revelation is to deny the very concept of revelation. What would a revelation represent if what was revealed was unfathomable?" Revelation must be assimilated through faith and knowledge. One cannot deny that through dogmatic definitions "the content of the faith has become clearer in the consciousness of the Church." It is not inconceivable that there will be new ecumenical councils and that they will establish new norms.

However, the substance of the question was somewhat different: Can one live and be inspired by dogma? Is it necessary? Leporskii certainly made it appear impossible and unnecessary. Truth is incommensurate with the human mind and therefore unattainable. Merezhkovskii had good reason to ask: "if every moment of prayer is a revelation, why do you not admit that there will be revelations upon which the fate of the world will depend, a new image of the Church, a new form of morality?" Bishop Sergii (Stragorodskii) answered: "In my own solitary prayer revelations do occur, but none of these revelations has any significance, for example, for science and art."

It was noted in the debates that "development" dies not mean "fundamental change," although this was not clear to everyone.

> Dogmatic development is not only possible, but necessary. Objective truth, given by God, has been experienced by humanity, is being experienced, and will continue to be

> experienced. Christ placed leaven in the flour . . . . The development of dogmatic formulas surely must take place, for otherwise human history is completely erased. We must increasingly explore, by intellectual effort, that truth which has been given us, and clothe it in new expressions. These new expressions will testify to the life of the Church, to the true life of religious consciousness, which is able to grow organically, without deviations. . . . The development of dogmas is nothing other than the development of our whole life, of man himself, in the image of Christ. (Archpriest I. Slobodskoi)[38]

There remained only the problem of the ways of development, not development itself. During the debates, V. Rozanov and N.M. Minskii, the direct opponents of all dogma and dogmatism, quite trenchantly stated their position. The debate, of course, remained unfinished.

Not all of the "churchmen" who took part in the meetings can be considered true and precise spokesmen for the thought, doctrine, and tradition of the Church. There was little agreement among them, and only a few could actually be called theologians. All the shortcomings of theology as taught in the schools were felt in the debates. This was particularly true for the moralism and the distinctive agnosticism that characterized the second half of the nineteenth century. Father S.A. Sollertinskii, in one of his speeches, expressed all this quite clearly.[39]

> The time for occupying ourselves with theoretical investigations of Christianity is passed. Is it not now time to recognize the fact that even as our minds are becoming so enlightened and capable of grasping the profundity of Christianity, our actions, conduct, and moods turn out to be not only not Christian, but, in a real sense, pagan?. . . . Anyone who wishes to live and to understand the peculiarities of our time must understand that the chief duty of every contemporary Christian is to master Christianity through exercise of the will. . . . The ethical question must be raised in everything, and I think that what is needed now is not dogmatics (which deserves full attention and respect in its own right). . . Should not all the powers of our mature reason be concentrated on achieving moral ends?

Further on he speaks of "diverting the dogmatic to the moral," for which Kant sets the example. "We cannot present God in his divinity"—

this defines the inaccessibility of dogmatics. "From here arises the aspiration to translate all dogmatics, all theology, into the language of morality and to seed out the moral meaning in everything. At first it was said that Christ died for us. Then begins talk of our death for Christ."

There was a dangerous misunderstanding here. Merezhkovskii immediately objected that "in religion, one must start from God, not from the good." The "peculiarity of the times" was in its philosophical breakout: metaphysical interests tempestuously awoke, and theological curiosity and sensitivity were aroused. Under such circumstances, to "divert" attention from dogmas was not only untimely but dangerous. It was necessary, on the contrary, to put this awakening of theological interests through the strict school of history, through a trial of asceticism and patristics. Yet it so happened that theology became an object of interest in society before it became one in the schools. There was an indisputable psychological truth in what Merezhkovskii said at one of the last meetings.

> Christianity is surprising and festive for us in the highest degree. We—the wayfarers on the highroad, the publicans, sinners, adulterers, robbers, tramps, anarchists, and nihilists—are precisely the unsummoned, uninvited guests at the feast. We are still in the darkness of our night, but we have already heard the second call of the bridegroom. Timidly, ashamed of our ugly, unspiritual and unchurchly appearance, we approach the wedding chamber and are blinded by the radiance of the festivities. Yet dead academics—that old servant of the master—will not let us in. Although we have come to rejoice at the feast, they do not wish to believe it under any circumstances. . . . The theologians have become too accustomed to Christianity. For them it is as drab as workdays.

There was, however, an observe side as well. The intelligentsia returned to the Church in expectation of reform. Psychologically speaking, reform was given the major emphasis. But it held a very serious danger, and the "new religious consciousness" came unhinged at this point. Here was a new form of that same old and typically utopian failing: insensitivity to history. In his own day S.N. Bulgakov aptly remarked:

> By changing into Christian garb and devoutly taking its experiences and customary heroic pathos for righteous

> Christian indignation, it was the easiest thing for the intelligentsia to see itself as a revolution in the Church, contrasting its new sanctity and religious consciousness with the falseness of the "historical" Church. Such a Christianizing *intelligent*, often incapable of meeting even the most average demands of a member of the "historical" Church, easily discovers himself to be another Martin Luther or, still better, a prophetic bearer of a new religious consciousness. He is called not only to renew the life of the Church, but to create new forms for it, if not a new religion.

The Russian intelligentsia had to pass through the strict and severe ordeal of self-examination and self-instruction if it was to more profoundly and sincerely enter into the actual reality of the being and life of the Church.[40] As Merezhkovskii put it at one of the meetings:

> We have reached a misunderstanding. We will achieve nothing until we realize that we are on the eve of a great event in the Church, on the eve of a council. It has become clear that as long as we are discussing abstractions, we remain outside of practical themes and will not finish anything. A church council, i.e., the mutual cooperation of the clergy, laity, and the people in general, is necessary in order to turn actively and directly to God with prayer and beg him for strength. As long as we remain only a religious-philosophical gathering primarily devoted only to a discussion of the faith, we shall get nowhere. But when the council–that great activity of the Church–commences, everything will instantly clear up, for grace will appear.

A new ascent should have begun in the Church–not just an awakening of pastoral attention to culture, but a spiritual preoccupation with theological culture and cultural life in general. Life, the logic of history, and the logic of events demanded both.

IV

THE QUESTION OF REFORM

The question of reform was, in that same period, raised in the highest circles, and under very characteristic circumstances. The outcome was, of course, predetermined: an imperial decree of December 12, 1904 called for the "strengthening of the principle of religious toleration." Yet while the drecree was under discussion in the Council of Ministers, Metropolitan Antonii of St. Petersburg brought up the necessity of immediately changing the institutional position of the "prevailing Church" --- for otherwise it would only remain restricted in its activities by government prompting or protection. Such protection impedes independent action by the bishops and clergy of the Church and "renders the voice of the Church extremely inaudible, both in private and in public life." The primary task was to achieve and strengthen independence. The metropolitan's memorandum was drawn up from the point of view of the state, as it was earmarked for the government.

> Should not the Orthodox Church be granted greater freedom over its internal affairs? Guided primarily by the canons of the Church and the moral and religious needs of its members, and freed from an outright civil or political mission, its renewed moral authority might become an irreplaceable pillar of an Orthodox state.

At that same time S. Iu. Witte, then Chairman of the Council of Ministers, introduced for consideration his note "On the Present Position of the Orthodox Church." In it he referred to Bishop Sergii Stragorodskii's opinion that "to grant freedom of conscience to all at this time means to unbind everyone else's hands while leaving bound those of the church officials." Captivity has created an inert Church. "The enlivening of its frozen life can only be accomplished in a return to the original canonical forms of Church administration." What Witte had in mind was the abolishing of Peter the Great's reforms, the summoning of a church council, and the restoration of *sobornost'* in the life of the Church. He too, of course, was speaking from the governmental or political point of view. He wished to undo the "mortifying effects of a rigid bureaucracy" by the awakening of

independence in society. "What the state requires of the clergy is a conscious, well-conceived defense of its interests, not a blind faith in its present circumstances." In his note Witte sketched out a preliminary program of reform, whose main points were the renewal of the parish, financial support for the clergy, decentralization of administration, and reformation of the ecclesiastical schools.

Pobedonostsev immediately pronounced a strong protest against the proposals of both Witte and Metropolitan Antonii. He succeeded in securing an imperial directive to "exclude the question from the Conference and transfer it to the Holy Synod for examination." It was, after all, hardly proper to give a non-canonical formulation to the question of restoring canonical order or to restore church independence through secular legislation, by-passing church organs. Pobedonostsev's intention, however, was, if he could not entirely suppress the question of reforms, then at least to minimize it and render it harmless. In his reply he defended the existing order with great passion, denying outright the existence of any "constraint." His line of reason could be taken to mean that the inactivity of the Church, if it did exist, was more the result of its own impotence rather than a consequence of the dominance of the state.

Witte replied with a second note. This time the Synod turned straightaway to a discussion of the question of reform, and in a few days drew up a report calling for a council in Moscow at the earliest possible date, the restoration of the patriarchate, and the restructuring of the Synod itself. The emperor, probably under Pobedonostsev's inspiration, found it impossible to convene a council at such a tumultuous moment. All the same, the decision to convene one had been taken. In the summer of 1905 the Synod invited the diocesan bishops to present their views on a rather broad series of questions to be put before the council. The bishops were to consult with their clergy and laity. Some dioceses held pastoral councils or assemblies, thereby introducing a certain amount of conciliar expression and preparation.

Discussion of the anticipated reforms had already begun in the press with the publication of a pamphlet presented to Metropolitan Antonii by a group of St. Petersburg priests (known as the "group of thirty-two") regarding the convocation of a council and the restoration of *sobornost'*. This tract, written in the spirit of a rather diffuse ecclesiastical liberalism, lacked a sufficient degree of spiritual focus. Both the press and the local assemblies debated the issue more from a secular than from an ecclesiastical standpoint.

The opinions of the bishops, presented at the end of the year and immediately published, constitute a very important historical document.

In January of 1906 the Synod resolved to form a "special office" to prepare an agenda for the forthcoming council, and invited the participation of bishops, clergy, scholars, and representatives of the general public. Metropolitan Antonii was designated the director of the "office." This resolution was published in an imperial manifesto of January 16, 1906. By that time Pobedonostsev was no longer over-procurator, having retired in conjunction with the manifesto of October 17, 1905. The pre-conciliar "office" opened on March 8, 1906, concluding its work on December 15 of the same year. The "office" was quite large and the work went forward at a brisk pace. The protocols of its meetings were soon published. The pledge to convene a general council was reaffirmed and the office proposed a considerable number of organizational and administrative changes, but its decisions were not carried out. Nothing was changed; reaction set in anew.

The *Reports* [*Otzyvy*] of the diocesan bishops revealed a refreshing self-awareness in the Church. The hierarchs boldly assessed the existing situation, displaying a will for genuine improvement. Yet they dwelled almost exclusively on problems of organization and administration. It is true, of course, that the questions under review did not leave much scope for a discussion of the problems of spiritual life. Nearly every bishop mentioned the uncanonical character of the synodal order. Antonii Khrapovitskii, then Bishop of Volynia, was the most critical. The majority of the bishops insisted on the restoration of the conciliar principle, as well as on the necessity of a new definition of the Church and its clergy with society; that is, with the people of the Church.

Essential disagreements also surfaced. The question of the composition of the council provoked one of the most important of such disagreements. Was it to consist only of bishops, or was there to be a place and vote for representatives of the clergy and laity as well? The pre-conciliar office itself debated this question with great passion. In it every disagreement between the conservatives and the renovators was brought into bold relief. The arguments betrayed the mutual irritation and lack of understanding among the various elements in the body of the Church, which were impossible to surmount only through legislative and administrative reforms. Everyone talked too much about "interests" and influence, and they were too anxious about defending these interests and balancing these influences. The supporters of a broadly representative council did not have a very precise understanding of the nature of the Church, conceiving it as a kind of constitutional structure. Yet those who argued with them did not possess a very wide

ecclesiastical horizon either. There was too much bitterness and mistrust.

The problem of the ecclesiastical schools received great attention in the hierarchs' reports. Once again it was archbishop Antonii of Volynia who spoke most decisively of all, with immoderate anger and irritation. Reform is not worth the thought. "The very character of the ecclesiastical school system, inherited from the heretical West, deforms every effort to remake it." A new beginning must be made at the ground floor. To support his argument, Antonii cites the words of a certain venerable prelate: "Everything must be purged, pulled down; the very foundations of the seminary and academy buildings must be dug up, and new buildings filled with new people must be erected on a new site." Only one other bishop, Vladimir of Ekaterinenburg, responded in the same style. "Basic reform of church education must begin with the sale of the enormous academy and seminary buildings in the cities soiled by dishonor. The schools must be transferred to monasteries and villages, where they can be built anew on a modest scale, in a Christian manner." The majority favored the previously rejected proposal of Archbishop Dimitrii (Muretov) to separate general education from pastoral preparation, while making pastoral education available to all classes. Such a plan was particularly urgent in view of the actual disorganization and near collapse of the ecclesiastical schools, arising above all from the fact that children of the clergy who sought a civil career were forced to remain in ecclesiastical schools.

Most dangerous of all was the feeling of servitude among the clergy, which had grown and had become transformed into a class bitterness, humiliation, and sense of social injustice. The clergy – the village clergy in particular – lived in extreme want, poverty, and often outright destitution. They were able to educate their children only in the "religious schools" of their class, and even this usually required a frugality that nearly reached the breaking point. The warped psychology of the clergy of Russia, which has often been despised as their "self-interest," arose precisely from such circumstances. This was a warped dream of achieving material well-being and security for their families that reflected their grinding poverty. Yet the only school accessible to children of the clergy prepared them for only one vocation. It was unreasonable to expect that the whole mass of "clergy children" would be seized exclusively with pastoral zeal. That never happened. Entry into other professions had previously been much easier, and had even been encouraged by the "higher authorities" prior to the "emancipation," which for the first time created broad outlets of activity for the children of merchants, city dwellers, and even peasants.

By the end of the 1870s the situation had changed, as the universities were practically closed to seminarians. From the 1880s onward the hold of the class school on "clergy children" became especially cruel. This new policy of enserfment yielded no useful results, while the flight of such youths from the "Department of the Orthodox Confession" reached alarming proportions. Still worse, many remained only out of necessity, compulsion, or fear. They were often uninspired, secretly bitter, and lacking in faith. And although all of this was only too well known, only negative measures were taken. At the same time, largely from political motives, an attempt was made to prevent non-clerical youths from entering ecclesiastical schools. The 1884 Statute had provided for the acceptance into the academies not only of seminarians but also of graduates of the public intermediate schools, after a competitive examination. There were always many from the secular schools who wished to enter the academies. In 1902, however, this provision was changed. Graduates of the classical gymnasia could be admitted to the entrance examination "not otherwise than" by successfully passing an examination in all of the theological subjects included in seminary instruction. Such a requirement had hardly any scholarly foundation, as the competitive entrance examinations themselves were a sufficient test. The moving force here was a desire to fence off the academies from the public schools.

These measures could not settle the matter. A more courageous solution was required. Preserving such an outmoded school, which bore little relevance for social conditions or the needs of the Church, made little sense; combining the task of training pastors with the task of the education of a self-enclosed religious caste proved impossible. Consequently, the pre-conciliar office voted by a substantial majority to divide these two functions. "Schools of general education in the religious department" were to retain their "Christian-humanistic" style with a few innovations, including more instruction in philosophy and classical languages. Opinions differed on how to organize pastoral training. Some talked of "schools for church readers." Bishop Germogen of Saratov wished to train seminarians merely as "educated readers of the Holy Scriptures." He suggested condensing the systematic course on dogmatic and moral theology, in order to "avoid superfluous details." Others insisted on creating several types of pastoral schools to meet the extreme variety of tasks and conditions of pastoral work. One proposal was to organize a more elementary school linked to the upper grades of the parochial school system and separate from the existing seminaries. Such an arrangement was supposed to provide for both an "intimacy with the people" and a stream of new candidates for the priesthood,

thereby renewing and transforming the very character of the clergy. Archbishop Stefan (Arkhangelskii) of Mogilev vigorously defended this idea. Later, in 1910, the educational committee of the Holy Synod (with the participation of coopted members) prepared a similar plan of reform. Reform, however, stopped there.

Meanwhile, the lack of candidates for the priesthood was becoming more and more obvious. In order not to leave the village parishes without the divine services for any length of time the diocesan hierarchs were compelled to appoint scarcely suitable candidates to religious posts. The composition of the clergy became more and more motley, with the inclusion of aged deacons and readers who had either not completed or never attended any school, pious laymen, and unsuccessful officials or retired officers. With such dubious preparation, their educational activity of necessity remained on the most elementary level. Priests drawn from the intelligentsia were not always better. Higher non-theological education is no substitute for a lack of theological development and training. Given the prevailing moralistic prejudices, however, no one expected or required a knowledge of theology from candidates for the priesthood. It seemed more important to have a good moral character and to acquire practical experience in the services. Instruction itself was usually reduced to proper morals and sentiments. The insufficiency of all this soon became apparent.

The higher theological schools constituted a special problem. A plan was presented for granting the theological academies "autonomy"; that is, limiting the responsibilities of the rector and diocesan hierarch while expanding those of the academic council. The latter was to have the authority to make final decisions in most educational matters. Partial "autonomy" had been granted in 1906 (and amended in 1908). Among the *Reports* of the bishops, it seems only that of Archbishop Sergii of Finland urged autonomy. He qualified his remarks with the stipulation that the rector be of episcopal rank, thereby canonically subordinating the academy directly to the central authority. Anyone who so desired could attend theological lectures, which would thus assure a "uniform church standard of education." Admission to the dormitories, however, was to be based on strict selection and subject to the educational authorities.

Metropolitan Antonii appended to his report a very interesting note written by Professor N. N. Glubokovskii. Glubokovskii suggested that Orthodox theological faculties be created in the universities "for the independent development of theology," with the academies retaining their nature of "scholarly institutes for the apologetics of the Orthodox Church." The Church would then not be responsible for all possible

theological errors. However, "independent and honest theology will always serve to mediate the knowledge of the truth and cannot in principle become hostile to the Church, for the Church embodies and proclaims that truth." After all, the Catholics are not afraid of theological faculties.

The opinions of Archbishop Antonii of Volynia must be mentioned once again, as he had more to say about the academic programs than anyone else. He wanted to curtail the teaching of systems and expand the study of primary sources; that is, the Scriptures and the Holy Fathers. "A system of Orthodox theology is something still to be constructed, and therefore one must meticulously study its primary sources instead of copying systems based on heretical teachings, as has been the case for the last two hundred years." Subjects of general education should also be curtailed. The teaching of literature, however, ought to be broadened to include modern literature, so that one can learn from it about life.

Only a few bishops touched on theological questions in their reports. Archbishop Makarii (Petrov) of Tomsk was one of them. A council of the Russian Church must first of all solemnly affirm the eternal power and significance of dogma, and express it not only on the basis of Scripture and tradition, but also on the basis of theological thought. "A more precise and well-founded conception of the redemptive act of Christ the Savior should be formulated." In other words, a moral interpretation was needed.

Bishop Ioann of Poltava proposed that an edition of the works of the fathers be published specifically for pastoral use, and that the Russian Old Testament be revised in accordance with the Greek texts. Academic teaching must return to the path of the fathers, yet it must be made clear that the voices of the various theological schools are not the voice of the Church. A Christian appraisal of contemporary culture must also be made. Archbishop Agafangel of Riga suggested that the general council reexamine the *Catechism* and issue a new and more easily understood exposition of the faith. He particularly noted the question of tradition. Several bishops advocated correcting the liturgical books, as well as the statute regulating the distribution of church books among the common people and the upper classes.

It remains indisputable, however, that attention focused almost exclusively on organizational reforms. Few acknowledged the need for a spiritual awakening; few understood that the restoration of inner peace and order could not be achieved by church politics, but only through spiritual and ascetic exploit. The only way out was precisely in ascetic collection or renaissance. The "ascetic idea," meanwhile, could not be a

formal one, for monasticism itself was undoubtedly in need of regeneration. The same could be said of the monasticism of the episcopate. Archbishop Antonii of Volynia harshly attacked the "widower" bishops, "who accepted monastic vows together with their administrative duties, just prior to consecration." "Not only were they thus deprived of the possibility of withdrawing from the vanity of this world, but they barely had the opportunity of acquainting themselves with the monastic order, which they, for the most part, had no sympathy for anyway." This same characterization could be applied to all of "learned monasticism," as a type or as an institution. The point was that such a formal monasticism could not be a reliable barrier against ecclesiastical "liberalism" and secularization.

The issue of church reforms remained too closely bound to the general trends in politics. Political reaction was immediately reflected in church administration. The question of reform was postponed, if not fully abandoned. However, some people continued to work in special commissions. In 1908 an inspection was ordered for the theological academies, and following in its wake the *Statute* of 1884 was completely reinstated. The academies were reviewed under the commission of the Holy Synod. Archbishop Dimitrii (Kovalinskii) of Kherson examined the St. Petersburg and Moscow Academies; Archbishop Antonii of Volynia inspected the Kiev Academy; and Bishop Arsenii (Stadnitskii) of Pskov was sent to the Kazan Academy. The review was hardly impartial, particularly in the case of Kiev, but the conclusions of the inspectors were to a large extent accurate and just. The academies were, in fact, too "secular" in style, ecclesiastically too "liberal," and lacking in the spirit of church life and discipline. All this could be overcome only through religious creativity; the clichés of the schools were ineffective. Victory could come only through spiritual strength, not formalism.

The new statute regulating the academies, which was issued in 1910 and amended in 1912, contained many useful details, such as an increase in the number of academic chairs and teaching faculty, the introduction of practical studies or seminars, and new subjects (for instance, the history of the Byzantine and Slavic Churches). But on the whole the new statute was composed in the spirit of administrative formalism – it lacked genuine inspiration. Nevertheless, from the turn of the century onward an undoubted elevation of spiritual life can be observed in the ecclesiastical academies. Theological literature also experienced a revival, although more in the form of new scholarly books than in the appearance of new ideas. This scholarship, however, is a convincing indication of theological sensitivity and attentiveness, a

testimony to the growth of theological culture, particularly in the realm of church history. Not only was new material collected, but a new synthesis was being prepared.

Mention must also be made of one more interesting proposal: a theological institute for women in the Skorbiashchensk Convent in Moscow. The abbess was to serve as supervisor. True, the plan called for an abbreviated theological-pedagogical institute that would not include classical languages. Its chief object was to be the training of instructors and teachers for the girls' schools under the central church administration and for those in the dioceses, thus eliminating the compulsion to use teachers who were infected with the secular, irreligious spirit of the regular women's courses. Nevertheless, the recognition of the need to allow women access to theological education was highly revealing, even if at first it was only for a specific purpose. (Incidentally, the academies were still only semi-pedagogical in - stitutions). The plan was ready by the spring of 1914, but any progress was prevented by the war. Apparently, however, there were some temporary courses offered.

V

RELIGION IN PHILOSOPHY AND ART

The religious awakening of the turn of the century was im - mediately reflected in philosophical creativity. Religious philosophy became a special type of philosophical confession and construction, marking the return of metaphysics to its religious roots. As such, it was a manifestation of an intellectual need for religious nourishment and reinforcement. This intellectual awakening can be detected even beyond the circle of "religious philosophers" – the successors of Vladimir Solov'ev – and beyond the conception or selection of religious themes. The philosphers of those years became religious in their psychological make-up. Even Russian neo-Kantianism acquired an original coloration. Gnoseological criticism somehow became a method of spiritual existence – precisely a way of life, and not merely an intellectual exercise.

Such books as Heinrich Rickert's *The Subject of Knowledge* and Hermann Cohen's *Die Logik der reinen Erkenntnis* were read both as practical handbooks for personal conduct and as ascetic treatises. And after all, were not these books written precisely for that purpose? Hegel and Fichte were later read in the same way, as a mystical act or experiment. Attention centered on purifying and informing phil - osophical consciousness. This was the crux of neo-Kantian "panmethodism." The problematics of Christian asceticism are thus restated: struggle with the chaos of passions and impressions, faith in rules and laws, elevation to higher conceptions, and attainment of impassivity. The difference is that neo-Kantianism seeks spiritual refinement and fortification in the impersonal forms of reason and law. Nonetheless, such a compelling search remains a religious one. Other philosophical influences, such as Husserl's phenomenology and the resurgence of the great idealist systems, also took on a religious cast in Russia. Religious pathos gave pre-war Russian "neo-Westernism" its strength, even though that pathos was concealed and errant.

Soon, however, many began to pose religious questions openly. The return to religious metaphysics was a journey on a new path through the religiosity of German romanticism, the metaphysics of German idealism, the mysticism of Böhme or Eckhart, and the works of Wagner or Nietzsche. Andrei Belyi was not the only one to link himself with Nietzsche – there was also Berdiaev. "Nietzsche was the forerunner of the new religious anthropoloty." So was Feuerbach. Yet the most important thing was not the search for a *Weltanschauung* but the need for an intimate spiritual rule or rhythm in life, for *askesis* and ex - perience. Thus, anthroposophy was enthusiastically embraced as something pragmatic, as a way of life. This psychological relapse to gnosticism remains a characteristic and instructive phase in the early twentieth-century religious development of the Russian intelligentisia.

The works of Andrei Belyi (1880-1935) best reveal the intimate side of the philosophical and religious moods and infatuations of the period. Both his personal fate and the images created by his imagination make the same point. He places the "Russian temptation" in the boldest relief, disclosing the anguished spontaneity of the Russian soul, the human soul, through which flow the troubled currents of the soul and spirit. The ascetic problem is posed ever more sharply as it becomes clear that it is not just the question of thought that is being decided, but the question of man's fate as well. In Berdiaev's words, "Philosophy is not a dream, but an act." Philosophy was called to solve religious problems. This intimate return to religious tasks was even more

important than the quest for a religious worldview. However, a real struggle begins at this point, and the deepest abysses are uncovered.

Belyi's early development proceeded under the influence of Schopenhauer, from whom he acquired his first Platonic motifs. Themes from the Vedanta and the Upanishads were soon added to his hazy pessimism, sadness, and musical illusoriness. In his young years Belyi read Schopenhauer's works as sacred writings, "one paragraph a day." From that time on his empirical activity was rather shaky. Most important of all, time ceased to be real. Belyi then passed from Schopenhauer to Nietzsche. The theme of the "eternal return" became forever his own theme: the "circle of return." There is no real movement in Belyi, no progress, but only rotation or pulsation (as F. A. Steppun rightly noted). "That which stands at the beginning and that which stands at the end are the same." Such a conception lends to all existence a certain strange transparency, and consequently an illusiveness – Belyi's "diaphanous faces." All boundaries are strangely blurred, as if existence itself had a certain whirling and wispish texture.

The problem of *sobornost'* thus acquires a very special meaning. The face nearly becomes a mask; personalities melt into one another. This does not represent a reincarnation but a hypnotically commanding mastery of each other or mutual possession, a vampire-like dependence of one life on another. It has the nature of a symphony. As S. N. Bulgakov noted at the time, such a demonic double for *sobornost'* is a Khlystian temptation. Belyi expressed this theme in his *Silver Dove* [*Serebriannyi golub'*, 1908], and perhaps even more emphatically in his "fourth sympathy," *A Cup of Blizzards* [*Kubok metelei, 4-ia simfoniia*, 1908]. Here man is shown to be precisely in a state of possession, locked in the cosmic rhythms, in the chaotic indistinctness of existence. There is a frightening inspiration in those "blizzardous litanies" ("Let us pray to the storm!"), in those fragments of "sepulchral blue." Belyi included in his symphony the theme of love, "sacred love." "A new religious consciousness is possible only through it." "The blizzard's message is a disturbing summons . . . Lovers' souls open in the blizzard." Of course, there is no encounter here, but only oceans of souls melting away in whirlwinds. This is the "voluptuousness of languishing souls," as Berdiaev put it. "Our path crosses through the forms of this world and travels on to the place where all are mad in Christ." That path is a road to destruction. But it was not so much a path as a circle – a circle of inescapable metamorphosis and reverberation. After 1912 Belyi passed on to anthropology, one of the blind alleys of religious neo-Westernism.

A. N. Skriabin (1871-1915) may be compared with Belyi. Skriabin's views are not particularly interesting – he was a helpless imitator in philosophy. What is interesting is his experience, his personal fate. His was an experience of cosmic languor, mystical but irreligious, lacking God, and without a face. It was an experiment in rhythms and harmonies. The demonic nature of this experiment is fully evident. It is enough to mention his Ninth Symphony – *The Black Mass* – his *Poème Satanique*, or *Flammes Sombres* – the dance of the dark flames.

Skriabin's work is illustrative in that the magical theurgic act or forewarning was an integral part of the composer's very intention to embody the mystery of cosmic destruction and ruin. Skriabin felt called more to a great vocation than to be a prophet. The cosmic languor in him reached such acuteness that he aspired to death, prepared death for the world, and wanted to bewitch and destroy the world, bewitch it into intoxication or frenzy with death. That would be the universal and final miracle. All of Skriabin's creative work was permeated with an intense eroticism. The Luciferian will to wield power and dominate through magic and sorcery is clearly present here. His pretentious theurgy was transformed into shamanism or the violence of a sorcerer, lacking all humility, spiritual experience, and holy trembling, and represents nearly a blatant lust for mystical dominance. Art actually becomes a "mysterious act," but a dark act, an evil occupation. Skriabin's creative work is also illustrative in that it unveils the satanic depths of a self-destructive art and the dark abysses of artistic genius. He gave to the apocalyptical theme his own original interpretation. Skriabin might be termed a doomed apocalyptic. His projected Mystery had of necessity to represent precisely the end of the world, for it corresponds in his design to the Christian expectation of the second coming. One could be freed from such cosmic rhythms only through a magical murder, a universal magical conflagration. Reverie reveals itself here as violence. Art ceases to be neutral, for it turns out that art cannot remain neutral. Without genuine faith it is doomed to degenerate into black magic. The magical motifs of the poetry of Briusov and the enigmatic creative work of Churlianis – permeated by a melancholic fascination – should also be mentioned here. Their sketches contain the same kind of mystical fog, the same play of spiritual shadows.

The religious significance of art became perfectly obvious during this epoch of esthetic rebirth. Yet this significance was revealed as a painful duality: enticement and sorcery. This is not psychology, but rather the profounder dimension of the phenomenology of religious

temptation. It served as the background for the contemporary phil - osophical movements.

VI

RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY IN THE PREWAR DECADE

The journal *Logos*, published by Musaget from 1910 to 1915, became the philosophical organ of the neo-Westerners. Its editorial policy, as expressed in the first issue, was typical. Written in the categories of Vladimir Solov'ev's first period, the editorial statement reflected that same primary experience – that culture had collapsed. The journal shared Solov'ev's thirst for synthesis as well as his pre - monitions. "Our age again writhes with the thirst for a synthesis." *Logos* even adopted a similar methodology: schools and trends were to be developed as the realization of the plenitude of wealth and diversity, in order that the promised synthesis would contain the "visible fulness" of all discoverable motifs. This was no accidental encounter with Solov'ev on the common ground of romantic premises, but a deliberate conformity to his designs, the purpose of which was to demonstrate the differences more emphatically. The main difference was that the neo-Westerners sought a synthesis in a general sense for life and in cultural creativity instead of in a historical and concrete religion, even though their very sense for life became religious, just as in German roman - ticism. The German anthology *On the Messiah* was characteristic. Its Russian contributors were disciples of Rickert. It contained the typical messianic key to the times, as well as a premonition of creative works to be accomplished, an apocalyptical attunement to the age.

During those same years German Kantianism also "returned"; a rebirth of idealist metaphysics occurred. Russian thinkers took a cre - ative part in that revival, and subsequently individual representatives of neo-Westernism had a vital relationship with the "followers of Vladimir Solov'ev." However, several years of intense disagreement and debate over religious experience and philosophical freedom preceded that en- counter. One might think that the champions of philosophical freedom would have wished to defend it from any limitation by dogmatic or

doctrinal premises. But they did not struggle for spiritual freedom. Neo-Kantianism or transcendentalism possesses a significant residue of skepticism. An exaggerated emphasis on the incommensurability of human knowledge with the fulness of being necessarily yields relativism. The soul halts on its journey and remains in an intermediate zone of wavering impressions and fleeting images and symbols. The temptation of psychologism once again broke out with full force. It could be overcome only by genuine religious experience and personal encounter. Man's freedom can be restored only in the knowledge of truth. It is precisely in religious philosophy that an unwavering sense of truth is regained. Religious philosophy gives intellectual vision and contemplation firmness not only in relation to an inexpressible private experience, but in the clarity of catholic confession.

V. F. Ern (1879-1917), a thinker with the temperament of a fighter, wrote more than anyone else at the time on this topic. His *Struggle for the Logos* [*Bor'ba za Logos*, 1911], a collection of polemical articles, remains the most characteristic part of his creative legacy. Ern was always struggling and fighting. His fight was not so much with the West in general, but with the modern West and Westernism, with the "meionism" of all contemporary European thought, which has been torn from existence and has lost its feeling for nature. His goal was liberation from the power of the illusive and merely transitory, and the return to being by breaking through to eternal and authentic reality. This was possible only in the Church. Being is known only because man possesses being in himself, or, in other words, "truth is accessible to man only because there is a place for truth in man," or man himself has a place in truth. But man must realize his potential and reach the heights of intellectual comprehension of existence. Thus arrives the moment of spiritual achievement and selfless labor in knowledge. Gnoseology is visibly transformed into asceticism and the teaching of the spiritual life.

Ern himself saw the struggle against psychologism and for ontology as the purpose of his philosophical labors. Psychologism in his view was intimately connected to the individualism of the Reformation. "Ontologism" is possible only in the Church, especially in the Eastern Church, but in the Western Church as well. Ern was particularly interested in the struggle for ontologism in nineteenth-century Italian religious philosophy, especially in Antonio Rosmini and Vincenzo Gioberti. Ontologism was, however, best realized by the eastern fathers – the Platonists, Gregory of Nyssa, St. Maximus the Confessor, and the Areopagite. Thus, in Ern one finds a philosophical return to the fathers.

"Psychologism" had to be combatted not only in philosophy, but even more so in social consciousness. Here the struggle becomes a defense of both culture and religious culture. That defense constitutes the historical significance of the famous anthology *Vekhi*, which appeared in the spring of 1909. The book had its share of bitterness, accusation, a sense of recent disillusionment and fresh pain, but there was no despair. Its harshness and vehemence was not for the sake of recrimination, but rather sounded a challenge. The very harshness of its accusations betrays only a sincere anxiety. The very indictment became a challenge, a call to work and creativity. The book was brisk and daring, representing not just repudiation but challenge, not just endings but beginnings. The paths of the participants in the symposium quickly and decisively parted; their meeting and cooperation seemed accidental or artificial. Yet that does not diminish its importance as a sympton.

Personal spiritual achievement and the pathos of absolute values formed the two basic intertwining ideas. The "absolute" can be attained only by personal effort or conversion. N. A. Berdiaev spoke quite eloquently on this point, comparing two spiritual conditions: the sense of guilt and the sense of resentment. Only the former, by its thirst for remission, redemption, and revival, contains creative possibilities and freedom. Resentment always enslaves and fetters. "Sweet hatred for the past prevents creative advance." A resentful consciousness is always turning back and consoling itself with bitter memories. Creative power is revealed only through repentance and reconciliation. "As far as the Church is concerned, the psychology of guilt and responsibility must decisively conquer the psychology of resentment and pretension." Thus began an open struggle with the utopian "nihilism" that had so dangerously infected Russian consciousness in the 1860s.

The struggle marked a creative way out in culture, first of all as a restoration of alarm for history. It was precisely in this period that historical coherency and continuity began to be sensed. History was revealed not only as a sign of the end but as a sign of creativity and duration. It was not only revealed in its apocalyptical dimension, but in its cultural dimension as well. This marked a vital surmounting of both an unhistorical utopianism or simplification and a hasty pseudo-apocalypticism. A will for culture, the acceptance of history, was evident. As Berdiaev once again powerfully put it:

> I detected the mystical sources of history, the mysteriousness of the powerful forces acting eternally in history. . . . It is easy to proclaim that absolute freedom is an eternal goal and that it contains the meaning of the world process. Absolute

> freedom is realized through history, through a mysterious, ecclesiastical, and cultural historical succession.

This leads precisely to the acceptance of the "historical" Church. Here Berdiaev was rejecting his own views more than anyone else's; he was overcoming his own former apocalypticism. "One can and must reach the new religious shore and strive for that mysterious horizon, only partially revealed by the prophets, through the sanctity of the ecumenical Church founded by Christ himself, through the sacred succession and sacred tradition of the Church."

S. N. Bulgakov shared a similar sense of created history. "History is a holy sacrament for religious consciousness and possesses meaning, value, and significance in all its parts. This was deeply felt in classical German idealism, especially Hegelian." But history is not something completed from men – it is the product of their work, labor, or special effort. Man acts in history – he does not merely endure or experience it. Still, "such empirical human construction does not fully exhaust the *noumenon* of history." History is resolved by a certain break; it is decided in eschatology. With this is linked the tragedy of created history. All of the problematics of Christian culture and religious activity in history are also involved. These are the same problematics of Vladimir Solov'ev.

This historicism derives in part from Marxism, from which it retains a considerable aftertaste of fatalism and predestination. Bulgakov was powerfully influenced by it. "We must affirm the acceptance of history with all our being and say 'yes' to its fiery catharsis: *amor fati*, the longing for divine fate." One must only stress that such fatalism had long been a psychological habit for the Russian intelligentsia. Fatalism is what attracted Fet, Tolstoi (in part), and later Andrei Belyi to Schopenhauer. Vladimir Solov'ev is a most instructive example. He categorically rejected man's metaphysical freedom, insisting on the absolute predestination of events. His conception of fate brings together all moral ideas.

The *Vekhi* anthology was only a symptom, not a summation, of the period – only a sign and a summons, not even a program. The individual contributors soon went their separate ways. It is sufficient to juxtapose Bulgakov's acceptance of the Church and the priesthood and the acute historical nihilism of Gershenzon (in *A Corner-to-Corner Correspondence*, or better yet in the pamphlet *The Fate of the Jewish People*). But in the economy of those years the power of life was more important than any individual achievements. "A religious agitation

burst forth inside Russian culture." Berdiaev's description captures what was central to those years.

Berdiaev also noted the chief danger. "The weakness of the Russian religious renaissance lies in the absence of a broad social base; it developed within a cultural elite." Yet where else could a spiritual quest begin? Time proved too short, and the seismic waves were unable to roll too far. The few have always shaped history; spiritual-historical values are not created by the many. Thus, there is always a danger of a social cleavage in culture. Much more dangerous was the narrowness of the historical base. The vitality of the flair for history still does not make up for the narrowness of historical horizons. The Russian religious "renaissance," strictly speaking, was only a return to the experience of German idealism and German mysticism. For some it meant a return to Schelling or Hegel, for others to Jakob Böhme, and for still others to Goethe. The increasingly powerful influence of Solov'ev only served to reinforce the enchantment with German philosophy, while the actual expanses of church history remained virtually unknown. The history of the ancient Church was customarily perceived through the images and interpretations of German historians. Even classical philosophy was received through German mediation. Overly pronounced echoes of estheticism and symbolism still remained lodged in the very sense of history.

It is customary to speak of contemporary Russian philosophy as if it were a uniquely creative product of the Russian spirit. This is completely false, for, on the contrary, the substitution of "religious philosophy" for theology characterized all western romanticism, especially the German variety. This was also the case with the Catholic speculative philosophy of the romantic period. In all, this was one of the most western episodes in Russia's development. It is highly characteristic that Berdiaev drank so deeply at the springs of German mysticism and philosophy that he could never break loose from this fatal German circle. His major pre-war book, *The Meaning of the Creative Act: An Attempt at the Justification of Man* (1916), well demonstrates this point. In this book he again abandons "historical Christianity" for the esoteric speculative mysticism of Böhme and Paracelsus, militantly pushing patristic tradition aside. "Patristic asceticism is now dead; it is a diseased corpse for modern man and modern times." Berdiaev was totally in the grip of German mystical visions, which cut him off from the life of the Great Church. This represents one of the most characteristic sides of Russian religious thought, marking a new phase of the utopian temptation.

Typical, too, for the pre-war decade was the Vladimir Solov'ev Religious-Philosophical Society, formed by a group of religious philosophers in Moscow in 1907. A religious approach to philosophical questions distinguished this new society from the old Psychological Society, in which the same members also discussed religious topics. The membership included S. N. Bulgakov and N. A. Berdiaev – who had recently passed through Marxism – V. F. Ern, V. Sventsitskii, P. A. Florenskii, and such representatives of the older generation as Prince Evgenii N. Trubetskoi, who was the most faithful upholder of Solov'ev's tradition. Andrei Belyi and other Moscow philosophers and writers also took part. The Moscow Religious-Philosophical Society was more like a religious salon or a religio-esthetic club. Such was its beginning.

Out of the entire group of participants in this society only P. A. Florenskii and S. N. Bulgakov went on to study theology. They were personal friends, and both became priests. Bulgakov first began to write on theology only in 1917, when his book *The Unfading Light* appeared. This work can only be understood in relation to his later development. Two other books by Bulgakov, *The Two Cities* and *The Philosophy of Economics*, are more characteristic of those years. Vladimir Solov'ev had a decisive influence on Bulgakov's spiritual development. Bulgakov accepted Solov'ev's doctrine of Sophia, which became the basis of his entire system. The same is true for Florenskii. Bulgakov's typical problematics of religious or ecclesiastical culture and Christian construction in history were linked to Solov'ev, and from there the path led back to Schelling, the Neoplatonists, and also the fathers and the experience of the Great Church – the Church of history, tradition, and patristics. The force of German philosophy greatly affected him, and the influence of Schelling's philosophy of economics, and even Kantian transcendentalism, was particularly intense. This is expressed in the very religious-philosophical problem posed in *The Unfading Light*: "How is religion possible?" The power of German philosophy is also evident in Bulgakov's limited romantic horizon, in his religious *Naturphilosophie*, and in his unrestrained lurch towards the "philosophy of identity." Yet Bulgakov confidently returned from religious philosophy to theology, and this provided him with an historical advantage and filial freedom.

The most characteristic monument of the pre-war period remains Father Pavel Florenskii's famous book *The Pillar and Bulwark of Truth* (1914). This book demonstrates in the clearest possible way every ambiguity and failing in the religious-philosophical movement. Florenskii's book is deliberately and eminently subjective. It was no

accident that the book is constructed in the form of a philosophical correspondence between friends. This is, of course, a literary device, yet it subtly conveys a spiritual tonality well suited to Florenskii's manner of expounding theology. He possessed a very powerful pathos of intimacy and a psychology of esotericism in friendship that bordered on snobbery. Florenskii spoke often about ecclesiasticity and *sobornost'*, but there was very little of the latter in his book. *The Pillar and Bulwark of Truth* is the product of an extremely personal writer, whose reflections and judgments always betray his solitude. Only friendship offered him an escape, and friendship became a romantic "creative brotherhood," that is, a friend virtually became a brother. For him *sobornost'* itself dissolved into a multiplicity of intimately friendly couples and was psychologically replaced by a close friendship between two people who became one. Florenskii always lived in a secluded, cozy nook, and such esthetic solitude is where he wished to live. He escaped from the tragic crossroads of life and concealed himself in a confined but comfortable cell. As a young man, however, he did join the Christian Alliance for Struggle, that strange experiment in dreamy religious revolutionism.

Florenskii had no sense for history. He neither lived in history nor possessed an historical perspective. He lacked an organic flair for the process. For him history was like a museum. Esthetically he de - lighted in it, admired it, and contemplated it, but always according to his own personal preferences or tastes. He was reproached for his predilection for *theologoumena*, for individual theological opinions. This was a very important observation, for he actually preferred theological opinions to dogmas, which were too catholic and public, too vocal and apparent. He preferred the muffled whispering of personal opinion.

The experience about which Florenskii wrote was decidedly a psychological experience, a stream of experiences. He verbally re - nounced both himself and his own experience, promising to convey only what was common to the entire Church, but his deeds belied his words. He always spoke precisely from his own experience and re - mained subjective even when he wished to be objective. Such was his equivocal character. In his book he presents his personal preferences as a confession of catholic experience.

All of Florenskii's constructions possess a quite distinct veneer of theological fascination. Yet his book contains a curious disjunction, as if two incommensurate fragments had been forcibly integrated into a single whole. He begins with a letter on doubt. The path to truth does not begin simply with doubt, but with outright despair. It begins in a

sort of Pyrrhonic fire, and then the lightning of revelation suddenly explodes in the tortured labyrith. But of what ordeal and path is he speaking – the tragedy of unbelieving thought or the dialectic of Christian consciousness? In any case, the question, as posed, suggests that the most important thing is to be rescued from doubt. One gets the impression that the way to God leads inevitably through doubt and despair. Florenskii's entire religious gnoseology amounts to the problem of conversion. He does not go on to the question of how knowledge is possible. Florenskii treats the problem psychologically, putting full weight on experience.

Florenskii's book begins in a tone of Kantian skepticism and semi-skepticism. Florenskii borders on Kant in his interesting doctrine of antinomies. For Florenskii truth itself turns out to be an antinomy. The entire second half of the book is written in Platonic and ontological tones. How is it possible to combine and reconcile Pyrrhonism and Platonism, antinomism and ontologism? The doctrine of Sophia and the Sophianism of creation comes to signify the utter logicality of a world in which, by its very construction, antinomies are impossible. Reason must be adequate for and commensurate with being. Evgenii Trubetskoi immediately pointed out Florenskii's excessive reliance on antinomism, but he did not fully develop his objections. However, he rightly noted one point: Florenskii's antinomies merely represent an "unconquered skepticism, a bifurcation of thought, and its elevation into a principle and a norm." In Christianity, on the other hand, reason "is subject to transfiguration, not disfiguration."

In Florenskii's definition, Sophia is a "hypostatic system of divine world-creating thoughts." But how then can this ultimate mystery of thought be an antinomy and not a system? The doctrine of sin does not resolve this aporia, for in Florenskii's view it is not only the weak and sinful consciousness that is antinomial, but also the truth itself. "Truth is an antinomy." The choice between "yes" and "no" proves to be impossible in general. Why does Christian reason remain in captivity, and why is it polluted by ignorance? Strangely enough, however, when Florenskii speaks about Sophiology he forgets all about antinomies.

Reason is saved from doubt through a consciousness of the Holy Trinity, about which Florenskii speaks with great ardor. He presents the speculative meaning of the dogma of the Trinity as the truth of reason. However, he somehow by-passes the Incarnation and proceeds immediately from a discussion of the Trinity to the doctrine of the Spirit, the Comforter. His book simply contains no discussion of Christology. The "experiment in Orthodox theodicy" is somehow carried out without

Christ. The image of Christ – the image of the God-man – becomes a vague shadow lost in the background. Is this not the reason why Florenskii's book contains so little joy? Its beauty is merely autumnal, dying, weary beauty. He does not rejoice in the coming of the Lord – he is overcome with expectation of the Comforter and with hope for the Spirit. Instead of rejoicing in the Comforter who has already come, he languishes and thirsts for a greater one. Similarly, he does not sense the ever-present abiding of the Spirit, who has descended into the world. The Church's vision of the Spirit seems vague and dim to him. He detects the revelation of the Spirit only in a few chosen people, and not in the "everyday life of the Church." It is as if salvation had not occurred. "A wonderful moment flashed blindingly, and . . . It is as though it did not happen." The world still remains dark, illuminated only from without, by a certain chilly predawn gleam of light. Florenskii has surprisingly little to say in his book about the sacraments. He sees no completion, but only anticipation. His heart longs for that which has not yet occurred, and therefore history for him is sadness. He is dominated by a certain languid melancholy. His entire soul is taut with expectation of that moment which is still to come. These are the somewhat unexpected refrains of a Merezhkovskii or a Novalis, and here one automatically recalls one of Belyi's early poems, "Sacred Days," dedicated to P. A. Florenskii:

> Yearning! O hearken to yearning, my brothers!
> The sacred yearning of these fateful days!

The epigraph of Belyi's poem is taken from Mark 13:19 – "For in those days there will be such distress as, until now, has not been equalled from the beginning when God created the world." In his young years Florenskii wrote poetry, and his verses are surprisingly reminiscent of Andrei Belyi, especially the latter's cycle *Gold in Azure*.

> The air becomes rarer
> Drunkenly swaying, the world whirls around, careening.

Here is a unity of lyric experience.

Florenskii found the "second testament" somewhat oppressive and stifling. The Logos is already the "universal *law* of the world." Consequently, the revelation of the Second Hypostasis does not liberate the world – on the contrary, it binds the world to observance of the law. As far as Florenskii is concerned, the revelation of the Logos substantiates the scientific character of the world, and therefore the

Christian world is an arid one, a world of law and continuity in which neither beauty nor freedom is yet revealed. One wonders what Pentecost meant for Florenskii. He awaits precisely a new revelation, not merely its fulfillment. At the end of time he does not await the second coming of Christ but the revelation of the Spirit. In any event, he neither sensed nor left any room for the absolute character of the epiphany of God in the New Testament. It simply did not satisfy him. He still yearned for and awaited everything.

Florenskii was possessed by the fatal poison of romanticism. Once again one detects an obvious discordance. Melancholy is strangely mingled with exultation. On one level, the earth has not yet been trans - figured, but on another, it is divinized at its eternal core. "Objectivity does exist – it is the creation of God." Florenskii finds hope not in the fact that the Lord has come and has revealed in himself the new path to eternal life, but rather in the fact that from eternity, in its very nature, "created being is drawn into the inner life of the Trinity." The world, as some "great being," is in its initial reality already a certain "fourth person," a fourth hypostasis. Florenskii speaks more emphatically and rigidly about Sophia than did Vladimir Solov'ev. He sees the supreme revelation of Sophia in the Theotokos, whose image is somehow separated from, and even overshadows, the Son of God. Strangely enough, Florenskii's "theodicy" contains no Savior – the world is somehow "justified" without Him.

Florenskii's book is instructive and significant precisely as a psychological document and a historical testimony. It is interesting and contains many successful and thoughtful pages and passages. Yet Florenskii was able to provide no more than a literary confession. The book is dramatic, but not forceful – it is languid and melancholic. Florenskii did not proceed from the depths of Orthodoxy. In the Orthodox world he remained a stranger. The inner spirit of his book is western, having been written by a westerner seeking salvation in the East through dreams and esthetics. The romantic tragedy of western culture was closer and more intelligible to Florenskii than the problematics of Orthodox tradition. It is highly characteristic that in his work he reverted past Christianity to Platonism and ancient religions. He became sidetracked in the study of occultism and magic. Such topics as Du Prel, Dionysius, and Russian folklore represented the themes he gave to his students for their dissertations. For his own master of theology degree he proposed an annotated translation of Iamblichus. In 1922 he published a prospectus for a new book, *At the Watershed of Thought: Outlines of a Concrete Metaphysics* . One can hardly imagine this as a work by a Christian philosopher. It was never published.

As was frequently the case in recent romanticism, Florenskii created an original combination of estheticism and natural mysticism. One does not find in him a genuine development of ideas, but precisely a mishmash of esthetic lacework. Berdiaev rightly noted that "people who believe in Sophia but not in Christ cannot discern reality." He was speaking about Blok and the other symbolists, but this same sort of thing could be said also about Florenskii, and even Solov'ev himself. Such a religious experiment was undoubtedly obscured by the perplexed duality of thoughts and feelings and by the confusion of erotic fas - cination. An esthetic seduction, like the earlier moralistic one, tempted Russian theology, and Florenskii's book was one of the clearest sym - ptoms of that temptation.

VII

THE END OF THE PETRINE ERA

The war was a spiritually troubled and unfortunate time. At first no one realized the war's spiritual danger. Many at the time believed it both impossible and irrelevant to apply moral standards to historical events – the lives of nations are not commensurate with personal morality and neither submit nor can be subjected to moral evaluation. There are values higher than the good. A "categorical imperative" too often only obstructs the realization of these higher values and impedes the qualitative "elevation of being." These "higher values" were too often to be realized only "beyond good and evil," and only in conflict with personal morality. "If there is a morality in the historical process, such a morality cannot be equated with individual morality." (N. A. Berdiaev). Moral consciousness, therefore, cannot serve as an absolute standard even in personal life.

There are plenty of reasons to spurn moral rationalism, which in fact is often reduced to historical nihilism and negativism (as in the case of Lev Tolstoi). Yet there is also a dangerous moral myopia in a hasty acceptance of the creative tragedy, in the liberation of the creative "element" in man from the ascetic control of an attentive conscience.

The themes of Hegel, Marx, and, in part, Nietzsche were very clearly being repeated at this time. The rehabilitation of the creative "eros" during the war years demonstrates a great moral confusion. The popular "element" was aroused during the war, but precisely in fury and violence. What was most needed was ascetic moderation, moral control, and precision in moral judgment. Harmful mystical forces accumulated in the subconscious. The mass hypnotic poisoning of the time produced growing restlessness, anxiety of the heart, ominous forebodings, superstition, fanaticism, evil spells, and even outright deceit. Rasputin's dark image remains the most characteristic symbol and symptom of this sinister spiritual chaos.

This ominous and poisonous lava erupted and inundated that historical moment during the revolution. In such psychological circumstances all historical problems and contradictions became particularly critical, as 1917 quickly proved. The same crisis was evident in the life of the Church, in its diocesan and general assemblies, in its official and private meetings. The eruption was elemental. The All-Russian Council experienced it, as the legacy of the dark past found expression – it erupted and could not be shaken off, pacified, or transformed into the wisdom of a creative historical synthesis. There was not time. The process continued and will continue, although it is difficult for the historian to trace it.

Only one thing is clear: the All-Russian Council of 1917-1918 was not a final solution, but only a beginning – the beginning of a long, dangerous, and cloudy path. There were too many contradictions at the council, too much indecision. The revolt of the Living Church and the subsequent history of the "renovation" movement and the church schisms underscored the indecisiveness of the council. The council marked a terminus and conclusion in one sense only: the Petrine era in Russian church history came to a close; the patriarchate was reestablished.

> The eagle of Peter's autocracy, modeled on the West, pecked out the heart of Russian Orthodoxy. By the impious Peter's sacrilegious hand the first hierarch of Russia was cast out of his centuries-old place in the Cathedral of the Dormitian. This local council of the Russian Church, by the authority granted it by God, once again seats the Patriarch of Moscow on his lawful and inalienable throne.

The patriarchate was not so much reestablished as created anew. It was not a restoration, but the creativity of life. The patriarchate did

not mark a return to the pre-Petrine age, nor a reversion to the seven - teenth century, but a brave encounter with the advancing future.

CHAPTER IX

BREAKS AND LINKS

CHAPTER IX

BREAKS AND LINKS

I

IRRESPONSIBILITY IN THE NATIONAL SPIRIT

The history of Russian culture is one of interruptions, assaults, renunciations or enthusiasms, disillusionments, betrayals, and breaks. Least of all does one find coherence in it. The Russian historical fabric is strangely tangled, shrunken, and truncated. "Schism and catastrophic disruptions best typify Russian history." (N.A. Berdiaev) Foreign influences play a greater role in Russia's general development than creative independence does. Even in the life of the people there were more contradictions and discontinuities than either the Slavophiles or the populists were prepared to admit—there was a curious connection between custom and rebellion.

Petr Kireevskii rightly noted that Russia exists on may different levels. The same holds true for Russia's inner life, for the subtlest inner construction of its national spirit. The Russian soul has long dwelt simultaneously in several ages and on several levels of development. This is not because it conquered or transcended time, but rather because it became fragmented among various epochs. Incommensurate spiritual formations that were the products of different periods somehow grew together and became fused. Concretion, however, is not synthesis, and it is precisely a synthesis that was never achieved. This complexity of the soul is a result of its weakness and excessive receptivity. The Russian soul is dangerously predisposed to and perfidiously capable of cultural-psychological metamorphosis or reincarnation, as Dostoevskii noted in his Pushkin speech. "We appreciate everything—the sharp Gallic wit, the gloomy German genius..." In any event, this gift of "universal sympathy" is a

fatal and ambiguous gift. Heightened sensitivity and responsiveness greatly impede creative gatherings of the soul. Wandering among epochs and cultures, one always courts the danger of becoming lost. The soul becomes lost, it loses itself in these plays of historical impressions and experiences. There is no time for the soul to return to itself–there are too many distractions and beguilements, it is suppressed in foreign ways of life. The soul acquires nomadic ways, the habit of living amidst ruins or in the warrior's tent. The Russian soul tends to lose track of its kin–i.e., it persists in negations and rejections.

There is a certain truth in the frequent remark about the dream-like quality and feminine sensitivity of the Russian soul. Yet the source of the problem is not in a plastic and highly fusbile "element" of natural life that has not yet been fortified or encompassed by the "logoi" or crystallized in cultural construction. One can neither fathom nor exhaust Russia's temptation through some naturalistic counterposition of "nature" and "culture." Such a temptation is born already within culture. Generally speaking, the "national spirit" is not as much a biological as a historical and creative quantity. The Russian "element" is certainly not an innate "existential fit of passion" or some natural and native "ancient chaos" that has not yet received sight, remaining unenlightened and unilluminated by the light of the mind. Such a chaos is new and derivative; it is a historical chaos, the chaos of sin and the fall, the collapse of a soul darkened and blinded by disobedience, contention, and obstinancy. Not only was the Russian soul afflicted with primordial sin and contaminated by an "innate Dionysianism," but, more importantly, it was weighed down with its own conscious and unconscious historical sins. "A dark and slimy morass of base thoughts gnaws within me."

The true source of Russia's malaise is to be found not in this "natural" fluidity of the popular element, but in the infidelity and inconstancy of their love. Only love has a genuine capacity for synthesis and unity. Thus, the Russian soul, plagued with mystical inconstancy, proved weak and faithless precisely at the point of ultimate love. "Not daring to bear either the scepter of the Beast or the easy yoke of Christ," the Russians habitually and idly languished at fatal crossroads and perplexing junctions. In the Russian soul there is even a certain special passion and attraction for such crossroads and junctions. There is no resolution to make choices, no will to accept responsibility. It is too playful and artful; stretching itself full out, the soul lingers listlessly amidst enchantment. But enchantment is not love, or even admiration. A mere framework of passions or some

"mediumism" of mysterious kinship cannot provide a true fortress. Only sacrificial and voluntary love can do so. Divided and poisoned by its devotions, the Russian soul lost precisely its sense of sacrifice or willingness to renounce itself before the truth—the ultimate expression of humility in love.

The last thing to awaken in the Russian soul was a logical conscience, i.e., a sincere and responsible attitude towards awareness. Two temptations seduced it. First came the lure of "sacred being," the temptation of ancient Rus, Old Belief, and optimism regarding Christian construction in the historical world, followed like a shadow by apocalyptical negation in schism. Next came the temptation of pietistic solace, the blandishment of an equally western and populist modern "intelligentsia." This, too, in its own way, was a temptation of "being" – the enchantment of spiritual comfort. History is not accepted creatively, as an ascetic effort, a pilgrimage, or an act. The impotence of impersonal or even unconscious, spontaneous forces, "organic processes" or the "power of the earth," was always exaggerated in Russia's historical experience, as if history unfolds in the passive voice, as a phenomenon rather than a creative process. "Historicism" does not guard against "pietism," for historicism itself remains intuitive. In spite of all its historical sensitivity, receptivity, and power of observation, it eliminates the category of responsibility.

Irresponsibility in the national spirit is poignantly expressed in the history of Russian thought. Here is the key to Russia's cultural tragedy, a tragedy that must be understood as a Christian one and not one of Hellenic antiquity. It was the tragedy of willful sin and blinded freedom, not blind fate or primitive ignorance; of divided love, mystical infidelity, and inconstancy; of spiritual bondage and possession. This is why it spilled over into a terrible and violent assault of purple rage, theomachy, apostasy, and defection. And therefore, the only possible way out of this hellish storm of passion is through penitential vigil, through the recovery, collection, and sobering of the soul. Release comes through asceticism, not culture or social work. Escape, for the prodigal spirit, lies in the "inner hermitage."

II

THE SCHISM BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENTSIA AND THE PEOPLE

In the history of Russian theology one detects a creative confusion. Most harmful has proven the strange gulf separating theology and piety, theological learning and devotional prayer, the theology of the schools and the life of the Church. A split or schism between the "intelligentsia" and the "people" occurred within the Church itself. How and why it happened has already been explained, but one must remember that this break (or alienation) harmed and endangered both sides. This is so characteristically expressed in the 1912-1913 "Athos controversy" concerning the names of God and the Jesus Prayer.[1]

Theological scholarship was brought to Russia from the West. Having been a stranger to Russia for too long, it stubbornly spoke in its own peculiar and foreign tongue – instead of in the language of daily life or the language of prayer – and remained a foreign element in the church organism. Theology in Russia developed in an artificial and excessively limited environment. It began as, and remained, an academic subject, and as such it ceased to be a quest for truth or a confession of faith. Theological thought grew unaccustomed to listening to the beating of the Church's heart, and consequently it lost access to that heart. Theology received little attention or sympathy among the wider circles of church society or among the people. At best it seemed superfluous. Often, however, incomprehension was complicated by a nervous distrust and even outright hostility. Many of the faithful developed the dangerous habit of dispensing with theology altogether, replacing it with the *Book of Rules* or the *Typikon*, with ancient tradition, customary ritual, or lyricism of the soul. A baleful abstinence from learning, or even its avoidance – a sort of theological aphasia – was born. This was an unexpected a-dogmatism and agnosticism, for the sake of an imaginary piety – a heresy of modern "gnosomachy"

It was bad enough that genuine spiritual treasures, amassed through the labor of intellectual vigil and the ordeal of prayer, remained and were left unknown, but sometimes they were even secreted away and deliberately concealed. Such "ghosomachy" en-

dangered a healthy spiritual life. Psychologism in devotional practice always remains a temptation and a danger, both in private prayer and in liturgical communion. The temptation remains to accept or pass off piety as genuine spirituality. Such a temptation can take the form of ritual, canonical formalism, or a tender sensitivity, but in every case it proves to be a mirage. Only a disciplined, clearly conceived, intelligible, and self-effacing theology can guard against such a mirage – custom and canons cannot. The soul was caught up in a play of phantoms and moods. In such a psychological context, distrust of theology became doubly disastrous. Theological searching could find no fertile soil for itself. And without theological verification, the Russian soul proved curiously unsteady and defenseless in the face of temptation.

From the time of Peter the Great, "piety" was put off to the bottom of the social order. The disjunction between the "intelligentsia" and the "people" occurred precisely in the realm of faith. The upper layers of society very quickly became infected and contaminated with disbelief and freethinking. The lower classes, meanwhile, most often preserved faith as superstition and custom. Orthodoxy remained the faith only of the "simple people," the merchants, townsmen, and peasants. For many, reentry into the Church seemed to require simplificaton: an identification with the people, a settled, national-historical way of life, or a return to the land. Return to the Church too frequently became confused with "going to the people." Thoughtless enthusiasts, repentant intellectuals, ordinary people, and snobs all gave currency to such a dangerous prejudice. The Slavophiles were particularly at fault, for in their view the very life of the people was a certain natural *sobornost'* and the commune or *mir* was precisely an embryonic Church. Therefore, one could only return to the Church through the people. Even now this self-styled populism signifies for too many the required style of fervent Orthodoxy. The "faith of the coal miner," the aged nanny, or the illiterate churchgoer was accepted and passed off as the most reliable standard or measure; it seemed more appropriate and reliable to inquire about Orthodox life among "men of the people" rather than among the church fathers. Thus, theology was almost rather than among the church fathers. Thus, theology was almost entirely subtracted from the make-up of "Russian Orthodoxy."[2] Even now it is customary for the sake of piety, to speak of the faith in a somewhat artificial, imaginarily popular, unnatural, and pitiful language. This is the most harmful form of obscurantism, one into which many repentant intellectuals fell. Orthodoxy

is often reduced, in such an interpretation, to an edifying folklore.

> What would Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich say if he were told that true Orthodoxy, outside of the monastery, is preserved only among the peasantry, and that it has been lost among the boyars, the gentry, the distinguished merchants of the capital, the government servitors, and even among the various classes of city dwellers? In his day the pillars of the Church were the best men of the land, not the ignorant mass of the countryfolk, who preserved and still preserve, so much of a pagan "dual faith," and among whom the Schism took such deep root. (S.N. Trubetskoi)

The falseness of religious populism is manifested in the fact that the way of repentance was never, and could never be, an "organic" path, although the spiritual wholeness of the soul is restored and confirmed through repentance. Repentance is always a crisis, and "crisis" means judgment. The sole means of genuine entry into the Church is a strict ascetic trial, not some return to the people, to primitive wholeness and simplicity. Fasting and self-mortification are more important than custom or the ritual of life. What is necessary is not a return to a native primitivism but entry into history and the acquisition of its ecumenical and catholic traditions.

> Christianity in Russia, as everywhere else, is ceasing to be primarily a popular religion. The people, the common people, are passing in significant numbers into semi-enlightenment, materialism, and socialism, and are experiencing the first flights of Marxism, Darwinism, and so on, while the intelligentsia, the highest cultural stratum, is returning to the Christian faith. The old, customary, and popular style of Orthodoxy is dead, and cannot be resurrected. Incomparably higher demands are being placed on the average Christian. The pious old baba is already a myth, for she has become a nihilist and an atheist. The philosopher, the man of culture, is now the believer. (N.A. Berdiaev)

The Russian spirit contains a fatal dualism. On the one hand, there is a genuine intellectual curiosity and restlessness, as well as Aristotelian "wonder." On the other hand, there is an arid and life-

less passion for simplicity. These two impulses clash, or, more accurately, this single impulse is bifurcated.

People often speak of Russian "obscurantism," but few sense its truly fatal and tragic depths. Its movement is highly complex, and it is precisely a movement, not a somnolence or languor of a thinking will – it is not a passive, but a very active attitude or posture. Quite divergent motifs are tied together in one hopeless knot. In the final analysis, this so-called "obscurantism" represents a distrust of culture. The direct distrust of many for theological scholarship is only a partial illustration of the general hostility towards it that contaminated all Russian creativity. In the history of Russian religiosity such "obscurantism" arose as anxiety and wariness towards a borrowed and self-contained learning that had absolutely no roots in the actual circumstances of religious life and experience. Above all, it was a protest and a precaution against an insipid type of learning. As frequently happened in the past, and still occurs today, such a protest is easily reduced to the most banal utilitarianism. However, learning or rationality does not constitute genuine knowledge. There were grounds and reasons for distrust, the ultimate source of which lies in the fact that theology ceased to express and witness to the faith and life of the Church. Such theology could justifiably be considered errant. Therein lies the basic paradox of Russian religious existence.

Faith is kept indivisible in the depths and innermost recesses of church experience. In its inner thoughts on God, its rule of prayer, and its spiritual exploits the Russian soul preserves an ancient and strict patristic style and lives in the full, unpolluted, and indivisible plenitude of *sobornost'*. Too often, however, thought has been torn from its sources, and the first people to return to thought, in the consciousness of their rootlessness, did so too late, "Obscurantism" was a dialectical precaution against such rootlessness. It could be overcome only by creative theological thought, and only when it returned to the depths of the life of the Church and was illuminated from within. When the mind will be contained in the heart, and the heart will see that which the mind contemplates, then there will be an entry into the understanding of truth.

III

THE BREAK WITH PATRISTIC TRADITION

The crisis of Russian Byzantinism during the sixteenth century at the same time marked the falling-out of Russian thought from the patristic tradition. There was no interruption in worship – at a glance Russian piety seems even archaic. But in theology the patristic style and method was lost. The works of the fathers became dead historical documents. Few knew the patristic texts or were able to sort out the necessary information and evidence. Patristic theology must be grasped from within. Intuition is hardly less important than erudition, for it alone resurrects and breathes life into ancient texts– it alone can convert them into living testimony. Only from within can one discern and discriminate in the teaching of the fathers what is catholic testimony and what is private theological opinion, hypothesis, interpretation, or conjecture. "The fathers are our teachers, but not our confessors or casuists. They are the prophets of great things, not the spiritual directors of individuals."[3]

Recovery of the patristic style is the primary and fundamental postulate for Russia's theological renaissance. Renaissance does not mean some sort of "restoration" or some repetition of or return to the past. "Following the fathers" always means moving forwards, not backwards; it means fidelity to the patristic spirit and not just to the patristic letter. One must be steeped in the inspiration of the patristic flame and not simply be a garderner pottering around amongst ancient texts. *Unde ardet, inde lucet*! One can follow in the path of the fathers only through creativity, not through imitation.

Two types of sympathy and self-awareness exist: individualism and catholicity. A "catholic consciousness" is not a collective consciousness or some "consciousness in general." The "I" is neither removed nor dissolved in the "we," and neither does it become a passive medium for some ancestral consciousness. On the contrary, personal consciousness is fulfilled in catholic transfiguration, it is released from self-isolation and alienation and absorbs in itself the fulness of other individualities. As Prince S.N. Trubetskoi aptly put it: "One contains within oneself a catholicity with all others." Thus, one acquires the ability and strength to receive and express the consciousness and life of the whole. Only in the *sobornost'* of

the Church is such "catholic transfiguration" of the consciousness actually possible. "Fathers and teachers" are those who, in the measure of their humility before the truth, receive the gift of expressing the catholic consciousness of the Church, for we learn from them not only their personal opinions or conceptions, but precisely the testimony of the Church. They speak from the depths and fulness of its catholicity: they theologize within the element of *sobornost'*. This is precisely the quality that must be learned once more. The theologian must learn to discover himself continually within the Church through ascetic trial and self-discipline. *Cor nostrum sit semper in Ecclesia!*

One must ascend to the catholic level, outgrow one's subjective narrowness, and depart from one's private, secluded nook. In other words, one must grow into the Church, live in its mysterious supratemporal and integral tradition, and combine in oneself all the fulness of its revelation and insight. In this and in this alone is there assurance of creative productivity. It will not be found in some pretentious affirmation of prophetic freedom. Concern for freedom is not as important as concern for truth. Only the truth can set one free. Only by a dangerous self-deception can one demonstrate that "rootless and schismatic thought is always freer." Freedom lies neither in rootlessness nor in having roots, but in truth, in the truthfulness of life, in the illumination that comes from the Holy Spirit. The Church alone possesses the strength and power necessary for genuine catholic synthesis. This power constitutes its power to teach, its *potestas magisterii*, and its gift and anointment of infallibility.

The knowing consciousness must expand and incorporate the fulness of the past, combined with an uninterrupted growth. Theological consciousness must become historical consciousness, and only in the measure of its historicity can it be catholic. Insensitivity to history always leads to an arid sectarianism of doctrinaire scholasticism. Historical sensitivity is an essential requirement for a theologian. It is also an essential condition for a sense of the Church. The person who is insensitive to history can hardly be a good Christian. It is scarcely accidental that the collapse of ecclesiasticity during the Reformation was linked to a mystical blindness toward history. It is true that, in the polemic with Rome on "innovation," the Protestants created church history as a special branch of study, and subsequently developed it more fully than did any other confession. But the actual phenomenon of church history held no religious significance or power for them. Their history is always the history

of a decline – they study history precisely to prove the fact of this "decline" – and what is sought is always the "primitive Christianity" that existed before history.

This is the decisive element in the so-called "modernist" theology. It is a form of a historical lack of faith, or lack of faith in history – the offshoot of historical positivism and humanism. Christian truth began to seem undemonstrable in history, as something that could be affirmed only by "faith." History knows only Jesus of Nazareth, while the Christ in him is professed only by faith. Such historical skepticism can be overcome only within the Church, in the *sobornost'* of the Church's experience, in which the great depths of historical being are disclosed. Such experience is more profound than that surface over which the humanist's eye glides and wanders. The Church recognizes and confirms dogmatic events as facts of history. God-manhood is a historical fact, not just a postulate of faith. Within the Church, history must provide the theologian with a genuine perspective. To theologize in the Church means to theologize in the historical element, for the life of the Church is tradition. The theologian must discover and experience the history of the Church as the "process of God-manhood," as a departure from time into grace-filled eternity – the formation and creation of the body of Christ. Only in history can one feel the actual rhythm of ecclesiasticity and discern the stature of the Mysterious Body. In history alone can one be fully convinced of the mystical reality of the Church and be liberated from the temptation to twist Christianity into abstract doctrine or moralism.

Christianity exists entirely in history and is entirely about history. It is not just a revelation in history, but a call to history and to historical action and creativity. Everything in the Church is dynamic, everything, from Pentecost to the second coming, is action and movement. This movement is not escape from the past, but precisely an uninterrupted fruition of the past. Tradition lives and bears life in creativity.

The basic category in history is fulfillment or fruition. Theological labor itself can be justified as an ecclesiastical and creative construction only in a historical perspective. The historical sensitivity of Russian thought, together with the ordeal of its historical meditations and experiences, constitutes the best guarantee for any expected renewal in theology. Of course, this path of recovery of a sense of church history was traversed only conceptually, and even then too hurriedly and superficially. One cannot say that Russian theology, in its creative development, adequately and attentively

experienced either patristics or Byzantinism. That task still remains.

Russian theological thought must still pass through the strictest school of Christian Hellenism. Hellenism in the Church has been, so to speak, immortalized, having been incorporated into the very fabric of the reality of the Church as an eternal category of Christian existence. This does not mean, of course, ethnic Hellenism or the contemporary Hellas or Levant, nor the recent and wholly unjustified Greek "phyletism."[4] What is meant is "Christian antiquity," the Hellenism of dogmatics, of the liturgy and the icon. The Hellenistic style of "mysteriological piety" has been so eternally established in the liturgy of the Eastern rite that, in a certain sense, it is impossible to enter into the rhythm of the liturgical sacraments without some degree of mystical re-Hellenization. Is there such a fool to be found in the Church who would wish to de-Hellenize the liturgy and recast it into a more "contemporary" mode?

The most powerful element in Russian ecclesiastical culture is the Russian icon, and this is so precisely because in iconography the Hellenistic experience was spiritually assimilated and realized in a genuine creative intimacy by the Russian masters. Thus, in general, "Hellenism" is more than merely a historical and transitional episode in the Church's life. When the "Greek category" began to seem antiquated to the theologian, he only testified to his own departure from the rhythm of *sobornost'*. Theology can be catholic only in Hellenism.

Hellenism has two sides. In antiquity its anti-Christian side was stronger, and since then many have retreated into Hellenism precisely to oppose and struggle against Christianity. It is enough to mention Nietzsche. But Hellenism was also baptized into the Church. Therein resides the historical meaning of patristics. This "baptism of Hellenism" marked a sharp cleavage in its time. And the criterion for measuring this break was the Good News, the historical image of the Incarnate Word. Christian, transfigured Hellenism became thoroughly historical.

Patristic theology is always a "theology of facts"; it returns us to events, to the events of sacred history. All of the temptation for a "radical de-Hellenization" of Christianity, frequently repeated in subsequent history, cannot undermine the significance of the basic fact that the Good News and the theology of Christianity was expressed and fortified precisely in Hellenic categories. Patristics, *sobornost'*, historicism, and Hellenism are all attendant aspects of a single and indivisible design.

Objections against such a "Hellenistic paragraph" can be anticipated and foreseen. Such objections have been raised frequently and from diverse quarters. The attempts of Albrecht Rischtl and his school to remove all Hellenic motifs from Christian doctrine and to return to a purely "biblical" foundation are well known.[5] These attempts subsequently led to the reduction of all Christianity to humanistic moralism, in which form it was then rejected. Return to the Bible thus proved illusory. Every explanation of Christian revelation only in terms of the "Semitic" categories of "law" or "prophecy" turns out to be insufficient. Such categories have quite recently attracted many, and find their best expression in the "dialectical theology" of the school of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and others.[6] This is precisely an interpretation of the New Testament within the categories of the Old, in the element of prophecy without genuine consummation, as if prophecy had not been realized. History is devalued, with the accent shifting to the last judgment. The fulness of revealed truth is constricted. Biblical prophecy, meanwhile, finds its actual consummation precisely in Christian Hellenism. *Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet*. The Church of the New Testament includes both Jews and Greeks in a single new life. The categories of priestly Hebraism lose their independent significance, and any attempt to separate or detach them from the wholeness of Christian synthesis produces only a relapse to Judaism. The truth of "Hebraism" is already incorporated in the Hellenic synthesis, for Hellenism became a part of the Church precisely through a biblical grafting. Even a historical counterposition of "Semitism" and "Hellenism" is unjustified.

In the heyday of German idealism many conceived the idea of translating all dogmatics, and the dogmas themselves, from the antiquated Hellenistic language into the more comprehensible and familiar language of modern idealism, using the key provided by Hegel, Schelling, Baader, or others. Even Khomiakov got this idea into his head. These efforts continue even now. Is it possible for a man of "Faustian culture" to be content with the static code of archaic Hellenism? Should not all of these old and backward words be melted down? Has not the soul itself changed and already lost its affinity for these "fatal, hopeless images," and these obsolete words and symbols?

One must immediately ask why these symbols and categories became so "obsolete." Is it primarily because the "present" has forgotten its origins, is incapable of incorporating its own past, and is cut off and isolated from it? In any event, "contemporary philo-

sophy and psychology" are themselves subject to preliminary verification and justification in the depths of ecclesiastical experience. The Hegelian or Kantian mode of thought is in no way commensurate with that experience. One can hardly gauge the fulness of the Church by the standards of Kant, Lotze, Bergson, or Schelling; there is something tragicomical in the very idea. What is necessary is not a recasting of dogmatic formulas from an archaic idiom into a modern one, but rather a creative return to this "archaic" experience, in order to once more relive its thought and reinclude it into the unbroken fabric of catholic fulness. All earlier attempts at such "recasting" or transcribing unfailingly resulted in "betrayal" – i.e., reinterpretation in terms known to be inadequate. An incurable particularism infected all such attempts. These efforts invariably turned out to be topical, not contemporary. In practice, escape from "Christian Hellenism" does not mean "forward" progress, but a "backward" motion into the endless blind alley and aporia of that untransfigured Hellenism which is breached only by its patristic baptism. German idealism itself was to a large degree merely a relapse into pre-Christian Hellenism. Whoever does not wish to abide with the fathers and is afraid of falling into "patristic scholastics," whoever vainly endeavors to be in step with the age by plowing somewhere "forward" is fated by the very logic of things to be flung backwards, alongside of Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, and Philo – in any event, before Christ. A return from Jerusalem to Athens is out of date and useless.

Objections to the "Hellenistic paragraph" have been raised also by the opposite side – not by western philosophy, but by the Russian national spirit. Should Orthodoxy not be transposed into a Slavic key, to fit the "Slavic soul" newly acquired for Christ? One frequently encounters such projects among some of the minor Slavophiles – such as Orest Miller – and among some later populists. The "Greek" element is suspected of intellectualism, and therefore is declared a superfluous and inappropriate burden on the Russian heart.

> Not for nothing did our people adopt the Christianity not of the Gospels but of the Prologue, and were enlightened not by sermons but by the liturgy—not by theology but by prostrations and the kissing of the sacred vessels.

M.M. Tareev posed the question of the "Greek tradition" or influence with great forthrightness and directness. With full consistency, he extended his rejection of all Hellenism to include patristic tradition.

"The teaching of the Holy Fathers," it seemed to him, "is pure gnosticism." What was needed was a spiritual "philosophy of the heart." Even if such a typical product of Greek intellectualism does not replace dogmatic theology, it at least obscures it. Tareev heatedly denounced Greek oppression and the "Byzantine yoke."

> Greek gnosticism fettered Russian religious thought, smothered our theological creativity, and did not allow our own philosophy of the heart to develop. It starved the roots and scorched the sprouts.

Strictly speaking, Tareev merely provided an illusory foundation for that mute and very widespread Russian obscurantism that seeks a quiet shelter from all intellectual anxieties in a "warm piety" or a "philosophy of the heart." One is surprised by such a naive willingness to exclude oneself from Christian history and heritage, by the naive hostility and insensitivity of those who have forgotten their origins.

Russian theological thought did not suffer from Greek dominance, but precisely from a careless and hasty break with Hellenic and Byzantine traditions and ties. This falling out from tradition long left the Russian soul spellbound and barren, for creativity is impossible outside of living traditions. Any rejection of the "Greek inheritance" now can only mean the Church's suicide.

IV

THE TRUTH OF ORTHODOXY

Russian theology imitatively experienced every major phase of modern western religious thought – Tirdentine theology, the baroque period, Protestant orthodoxy and scholasticism, pietism and freemasonry, German idealism and romanticism, the Christian-social ferment following the French Revolution, the expansion of the Hegelian school, modern critical historiography, the Tubingen school and Rischtlism, modern romanticism, and symbolism. In one way or another all of these influences successively entered into Russia's cultural experience. However, only dependence and imitation resulted – no true encoun-

ter with the West has yet taken place. That could only happen in the freedom and equality of love.

It is not enough to merely repeat ansers previously formulated in the West – the western questions must be discerned and relived. Russian theology must confidently penetrate the entire complex problematics of western religious thought and spiritually trace and examine the difficult and bewildering path of the West from the time of the Great Schism. Access to the inner creative life comes only through its problematics, and one must therefore sympathize with that life and experience it precisely in its full problematicality, searching, and anxiety. Orthodox theology can recover its independence from western influence only through a spiritual return to its patristic sources and foundations. Returning to the fathers, however, does not mean abandoning the present age, escaping from history, or quitting the field of battle. Patristic experience must not only be preserved, but it must be discovered and brought into life. Independence from the non-Orthodox West need not become estrangement from it. A break with the West would provide no real liberation. Orthodox thought must perceive and suffer the western trials and temptations, and, for its own sake, it cannot afford to avoid and keep silent over them. The entire western experience of temptation and fall must be creatively examined and transformed; all that "European melancholy" (as Dostoevskii termed it) and all those long centuries of creative history must be borne. Only such a compassionate co-experience provides a reliable path toward the reunification of the fractured Christian world and the embrace and recovery of departed brothers. It is not enough to refute or reject western errors or mistakes – they must be overcome and surpassed through a new creative act. This will be the best antidote in Orthodox thought against any secret and undiagnosed poisoning. Orthodox theology has been called upon to answer non-Orthodox questions from the depths of its catholic and unbroken experience and to confront western non-Orthodoxy not with accusations but with testimony: the truth of Orthodoxy.

Russians discussed and argued a great deal about the meaning of western development. Europe actually became for many a "second fatherland." But can it be said that Russians knew the West? The usual outlines of western development contained more of a dialectical straightforwardness than genuine vision. The image of some imaginary or desired Europe too often obscured its actual face. The western soul was most often manifested through art, especially after the esthetic awakening of the end of the nineteenth century. The heart was aroused and became more sensitive. Esthetic sensitivity,

however, never penetrates to the ultimate depths. More often it serves as an obstacle to the experiencing of the full intensity of religious pain and anxiety. Estheticism usually remains too unproblematical and too ready too fall into an ineffective contemplation. The Slavophiles, Gogol, and Dostoevskii were the first to more profoundly sense the Christian anguish and anxiety in the West. Western discontinuities and contradictions were noted to a considerably lesser extent by Vladimir Solov'ev. He was too preoccupied with considerations of "Christian politics." In fact, Solov'ev knew little more about the West than unionistic ultramontanism and German idealism (and perhaps one should also add Fourier, Swedenborg, the spiritualists, and, among the older masters, Dante). He believed too completely in the stability of the West, and only in his last years did he note the romantic hunger, the agony of sick and grieving Christian souls.

The conceptions of the older Slavophiles also proved rather barren. Yet they possessed a profound inner relation to the most intimate western themes. Moreover, they had something even greater: an awareness of Christian consanguinity and responsibility, a sense of and longing for fraternal compassion and a consciousness or presentiment of the Orthodox mission in Europe. Solov'ev speaks more about a Russian national than an Orthodox calling. He speaks of the theocratic mission of the Russian tsardom. The older Russian Slavophiles saw their task in terms of European requirements, the unresolved or insoluble questions raised by the other half of the single Christian world. The great truth and moral power of early Slavophilism is found in this sense of Christian responsibility.

Orthodoxy is summoned to witness. Now more than ever the Christian West stands before divergent prospects, a living question addressed also to the Orthodox world. Therein lies the entire significance of the so-called "ecumenical movement." Orthodox theology is called to show that this "ecumenical question" can only be decided through the consummation of the Church in the fulness of a catholic tradition that is unpolluted and inviolable, yet constantly renewing itself and growing. Again, return is possible only through "crisis," for the path to Christian recovery is critical, not irenical. The old "polemical theology" has long ago lost its inner connection with any reality. Such theology was an academic discipline, and was always elaborated according to the same western "textbooks." A historiosophical exegesis of the western religious tragedy must become the new "polemical theology." But this tragedy must be reendured and relived, precisely as one's own, and its potential catharsis must be demonstrated in the fulness of the ex-

perience of the Church and patristic tradition. In this newly sought Orthodox synthesis, the centuries-old experience of the Catholic West must be studied and diagnosed by Orthodox theology with greater care and sympathy than has been the case up to now.

What is meant here is not the adoption or acceptance of Roman doctrine, nor an imitation "Romanism." In any case, the Orthodox thinker can find a more adequate source for creative awakening in the great systems of "high scholasticism," in the experience of the Catholic mystics, and in the theological experience of later Catholicism than in the philosophy of German idealism or in the Protestant critical scholarship of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, or even in the "dialectical theology" of our own day. A creative renaissance in the Orthodox world is a necessary condition for resolving the "ecumenical question."

The encounter with the West has yet another dimension. During the Middle Ages, a very elaborate and complex theological tradition arose and flourished in the West, a tradition of theology and culture, of searching, acting, and debating. This tradition was not completely abandoned even during bitterest confessional quarrels and altercations of the Reformation. Nor did scholarly solidarity completely disappear even after the appearance of freethinking. In a certain sense, western theological scholarship since that time has remained a unit, bound together by a certain feeling of mutual responsibility for the infirmities and mistakes of each side. Russian theology, as a discipline and as a subject of instruction, was born precisely in that tradition. Its task is not to abandon that tradition, but to participate in it freely, responsibly, consciously, and openly. The Orthodox theologian must not, and dares not, depart from this universal circulation of theological searching. After the fall of Byzantium only the West continued to elaborate theology. Although theology is in essence a catholic endeavor, it has been resolved only in schism. This is the basic paradox of the history of Christian culture. The West expounds theology while the East is silent, or what is still worse, the East thoughtlessly and belatedly repeats the lessons already learned in the West.

The Orthodox theologian up to now has been too dependent on western support for his personal efforts. His primary sources are received from western hands, and he reads the fathers and the acts of the ecumenical councils in western, often not very accurate, editions. He learns the methods and techniques for dealing with collected materials in western schools. The history of the Orthodox Church is primarily known through the labors of many generations of western in-

vestigators and scholars. This also applies to the collection and interpretation of historical data. What is important is the constant focus of western awareness on ecclesiastical-historical reality, the acute historically minded conscience, the unswerving and persistent pondering of the primary sources of Christianity. Western thought always dwells in the past, with such intensity of historical recollection that it seems to be compensating for unhealthy defects in its mystical memory. The Orthodox theologian must also offer his own testimony to this world—a testimony arising from the inner memory of the Church—and resolve the question with his historical findings. Only the inner memory of the Church fully brings to life the silent testimony of the texts.

V

A NEW AGE OF THEOLOGY

This historian is not called upon to make prophecies. He must, however, understand the rhythm and meaning of events. Sometimes it happens that events are prophetic, and when they are, he must discern the message, in its relation to other events. It is unarguable that in recent years a new era has begun in the history of the Christian world, an era that might be termed apocalyptic. This does not mean that one should impetuously try to divine undiscoverable and forbidden dates. An apocalyptical motif, however, is quite obviously apparent in the entire course of contemporary events. It seems that a theomachistic and godless rebellion is rising with unprecedented sweep and power. All of Russia is being reared in this theomachistic arousal and doom. The entire population, generation after generation, is being drawn into this seductive and poisonous ordeal.

No "neutrality," no simple prosaic matters or questions any longer exist in the world. Everything has become disputed, ambiguous, and divided. Everything must be contested with the Antichrist, who lays claim to all things, hastening to fix his seal on them. All people stand before a choice – faith or unbelief – and the "or" has become a burning issue. "He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters." (Matthew 12:30) The revolution revealed a harsh and painful truth about the Russian soul, uncovering the utter abyss formed by faithlessness, apostasy, affliction, and depravity. The Russian soul was poisoned, disturbed, and lacerated. Only

by the ultimate effort of open spiritual striving, by the light of Christ's reason, by the word of sincerity and truth, and by the word and power of the Spirit can a soul that is afflicted, bewitched, and disquieted by evil doubts and deceptions be healed and strengthened. The time has come for open struggle and competition for men's souls. The time has come for every question of knowledge and life to receive and possess a truly Christian answer and be included in the synthetic fabric and fulness of faith. Theology is ceasing to be a personal or "private affair," in which each person is free to participate or not, depending on one's personal gifts, inclinations, and inspirations. In this present time of deceit and judgment, theology must once again become a "public matter," a universal and catholic summons. Each person must be clad in complete spiritual armor. The time has come when theological silence, perplexity, inconsistency, or inarticulateness is tantamount to treason or flight before the enemy. Silence can be just as disastrous as a hasty or unintelligible answer; it can be even more thoroughly seductive and poisonous when one crawls into hiding, as if faith was a "frail and not quite reliable thing."

An age of theology is dawning once again. Our age is again summoned to the labor of theology. Many might find such an affirmation too bold, exaggerated, and one-sided. Is not the contemporary age better characterized by "social Christianity," if not since the "new Christianity" of Saint-Simon, then at least since the time of Lammenais and Morris? In our troubled age, does it not seem that Christianity has been summoned precisely to "social work," to the construction of the New City? Is it fitting now to divert religious awareness back to the intellectual problems of theology, and away from the real "social theme" brought to the fore by the irreversible course of events? Many regard such an effort as particularly unsuited to Russian conditions. Contemporary Russia is called to action, not contemplation! Is it permissible to weaken militant "activism" by calling for reflection and concentration of the soul? Many regard the labor of theology almost as treachery and desertion. But their objections and perplexities reveal a fatal myopia. Of course, now is not the time to be diverted from social issues; the "royal star" of socialism is there, burning in the firmanent of history. However, the social question itself is above all a spiritual question, a question of conscience and wisdom. The social revolution is ultimately a certain spiritually troubled tide. The Russian Revolution was a spiritual catastrophe, a collapse of the soul, an outburst of rebellious passions, and therefore it should be explained from its spiritual foundations. The mystery of Russia's future lies not so much in its social or technical construction, but in the new man

that they are now striving to build, create, and bring up without God, without faith, and without love. Has not the irreversible course of events placed the question of faith precisely at the fore, with an ultimate and genuine apocalyptical acuteness and frankness? Do we not see the entire intimate problematics of atheism and disillusionment, temptation and impiety, arising with an incomparable sharpness? "It is not the flesh, but the spirit that has been corrupted in our day– and man grieves in despair." (Tiutchev)

We are summoned to theology precisely because we are already in this apocalyptical struggle. With great attention and care, a firm and responsible confession of the truth of Christ must be opposed to the contagious and enveloping outlook of atheism and theomachy. No "unbelieving science," of course, is in no way neutral, but only a form of "counter-theology," containing too much that is impassioned and passionate, blind and murky, and often dark and malicious. A yearning does exist, and sudden insights are granted, but, however, from an opposite source. Here again theology is called upon not to judge but to heal. One must enter into the world of doubts, subterfuges, and self-deceptions in order to respond to doubts and reproaches. But one must enter this unsettled world with the sign of the cross in one's heart and the prayer of Jesus in one's mind, for this is a world of dizzying mysteries where everything is double, crumbling in a certain play of reflections, as if surrounded by mirrors. The theologian is summoned to testify in the world. The circumstances of the first centuries – when the seed was sown and germinated in the untransfigured world through that sanctified first sowing – are partially being repeated. At that time the bearers of the Good News had to speak most often precisely to untransfigured hearts, to the dark and sinful consciences of the "pagans" to whom they were sent and who sat in darkness and in the shadow of death. The godless and "unbelieving" world of the present is in a certain sense precisely the pre-Christian world revived in all its variegated interweaving of pseudo-religious, skeptical, and antireligious attitudes.

All the more must theology witness before such a world. A theological system cannot be solely the fruit of a learning born in philosophical reflection. The experience of prayer, spiritual concentration, and pastoral care are also needed. Theology must resound with the Good News, the *kerygma*. The theologian must speak to living people, to the living heart. He must speak within the context of sincere care and love, within the sphere of direct responsibility for the soul of his brother, particularly his unenlightened brother. Learning in general is not and must not be a dia-lectical, but rather

a dia-logical moment. The one who knows the truth testifies before those who are learning to know about the truth, he calls them to bow down and be humbled before the truth – and therefore he must himself be humble. Humility is particularly demanded of the theologian.

Pastoral routine and teaching cannot resolve the newly arisen task of constructing the human soul and conscience, and that task cannot be set aside. It is necessary to respond with a complete system of thought, with a theological confession. The entire problematics of the unbelieving and unseeking spirit – the entire problematics of willful error and unwilled ignorance – must be relived and resuffered. The time has come when evasion of theological learning and knowledge becomes a mortal sin, a sign not of love but of self-satisfaction, cowardice, and deceit. Simplification turns out to be a diabolical facade, while distrust for an inquisitive reason is exposed as a diabolical fearfulness. "They are stricken with fear when there is no fear." Here one may recall and repeat the penetrating words spoken long ago by Filaret of Moscow in similar circumstances.

> True, the gift and duty of being a teacher is not intended for everyone, and the Church finds few worthy to be called theologians. However, in Christianity no one is allowed to be completely uninstructed and remain ignorant. Did not the Lord call himself a teacher, and his followers disciples? Even before the Christians were called Christians, they were called, to the last one, disciples. Is this merely an empty title, signifying nothing? Why then did the Lord send the apostles into the world? Above all, it was in order to teach all people: "Go therefore, and make disciples of all nations..." If you do not wish to study and try to understand Christianity, then you are not a disciple, you are not a follower of Christ; then the apostles were not sent into the world for you; you are not what all Christians have been since the very beginning of Christianity. I do not know what you are and what is to become of you.[7]

VI

THE TASK OF ORTHODOXY

The future is more truly and profoundly revealed when seen as an obligation rather than as an expectation and premonition. The future is not merely something exacted or awaited – it is something created. The Christian calling inspires us exactly with the responsibility of duty. Creative strength, the power of giving birth, is unexpectedly found precisely in obedience. Self-will is the principle of dissipation.

A prayerful entry into the Church, an apocalyptical fidelity, a return to the fathers, a free encounter with the West, and other similar themes and elements make up the creative postulate of Russian theology in the contemporary circumstances. They also represent a testament of the past – our responsibility for the past and our obligation before it. Past mistakes and falures should not cause embarrassment. The path of history has still not been fully traveled; the history of the Church is not yet finished; Russia's path has not yet been closed. The road is open, though difficult. A harsh historical verdict must be transformed into a creative call to complete what remains unfinished. "And with many afflictions one must enter the kingdom of God." Orthodoxy is not only a tradition, it is a task; it is not an unknown quantity, but a given. At the same time it is an assignment, a living yeast, a germinated seed, and our duty and calling.

remained on it is a mysterious path of spiritual labor, or secret and silent labor towards the acquisition of the Holy Spirit. There is also a separate path for those who have fallen. Freedom and the power of spiritual activity, witness, and the Good News are still ours. By the same token, we also have the task of testifying, creating, and constructing. Only in such spiritual labor will the past, filled with premonitions and forebodings and all manner of infirmities and mistakes, be justified. And genuine historical synthesis lies not in interpreting the past, but in creatively fulfilling the future.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), the German philosopher of the Absolute, developed a system of metaphysics that dominated European philosophy in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Hegel was educated as a theology student at the University of Tübingen, and went on to teach philosophy at Heidelberg and Berlin. In his efforts to harmonize classical Greek ontology with Kantianism, he elaborated his "dialectic," a progression from thesis to antithesis to synthesis, a pattern that profoundly influenced Marx, who "turned Hegelianism upside down," as well as Vladimir Solov'ev. Hegel's philosophy became popular in Russia in the 1840s under the banner of Idealism, although it was opposed by such Slavophiles as Khomiakov, who considered it the height of western rationalism.

2. Apollon Aleksandrovich Grigor'ev (1822-1864) was a Russian literary critic and poet, whose worldview ranged from romantic utopianism to *pochvennichestvo*. A law student at Moscow University during the early 1840s, he went on to serve on the editorial board of the journal *The Muscovite*, and later worked with Dostoevski on the latter's journal *Vremia*. Grigor'ev was also known for his translations of Shakespeare, Byron, Goethe and Beranger. He is discussed in detail below, in section 10, "History and the Holy Life."

3. Often called Russia's greatest romantic poet, Mikhail Iur'evich Lermontov (1814-1841) attended Moscow University in the early 1830s. He became famous in 1837 for his poem "Death of a Poet" ["Smert' poeta"], in which he denounced the illtreatment that Pushkin received in his lifetime. For this he was exiled to the Caucasus. After a year he returned and wrote some of his best works, including the novel *A Hero of Our Time*. On July 27, 1841, Lermontov, like Pushkin, was killed in a duel.

4. Vasilii Andreevich Zhukovskii (1783-1852) was an important Russian poet and translator. He served as a tutor to Tsar Nicholas' son Alexander, the future tsar, and was one of the founders of the pro-Karamzin literary society *Arzamas*. Among the western romantic writers he translated were Schiller, Goethe and Byron.

5. Gustav Gustavovich Shpet, born in 1879, was a philosopher and a historian of philosophy. He wrote studies of Iurkevich and Herzen, but his most comprehensive work, *An Outline of the Development of Russian Philosophy* [*Ocherk razvitiia russkoi filosofii*], was not completed, and only the first volume appeared in Moscow in 1922.

6. Dostoevski's thought is discussed below, in section X.

7. Mikhail Osipovich Gershenzon (1869-1925) was a well-known Russian historian of ideas. See Florovsky, "M. Gershenzon," *Slavonic Review* (1926). Also in *The Collected Works*.

8. Ivan Vasil'evich Kireevskii (1806-1856) was a respected literary critic, publicist and leading Slavophile ideologue. He was educated at Moscow

University, where he came under the influence of German Idealist philosophy and joined the circle of "Lovers of Wisdom." In 1830 he traveled to Germany, where he heard the lectures of Schleiermacher, Hegel, Schelling and Ritter. Kireevskii returned to Russia in 1832 and published the journal *The European* (see note 104). Subsequently he turned from German Idealism to the philosophy of the Church Fathers. See below, section V. Several recent works on Kireevskii have appeared in English.

9. Odoevskii, *Russian Nights* [*Russkie nochi*] [Author's note]. V. F. Odoevskii (1803-1869) was the leading Russian romantic writer of the 1830s. Earlier he had been one of the founders of the Society of Lovers of Wisdom, a Moscow group devoted to the Idealist philosophy of Schelling. *Russian Nights*, a novel first printed in 1844, is available in an English translation by Olga Koshansky-Olienikov and Ralph Matlaw.

10. Christian Wolff (1679-1754), a German philosopher and mathematician, had quite extensive influence in the eighteenth century with his method of reworking scholastic philosophy on the basis of his mathematical method. Baumeister was another German philosopher, whose *Elementa philosophiae* had a special edition prepared by N. Bantysh-Kamenskii for use in the Russian schools.

11. D. M. Golitsyn (1665-1737) had a stormy career in politics before retiring to the village of Arkhangel'skoe, where he compiled a library of political and historical books by European authors. The library contained approximately six thousand books in foreign languages or Russian translation.

12. Feofan Prokopovich (1681-1736) was Archbishop of Novgorod and a close collaborator of Peter the Great in the latter's reform of the Church and State. Feofan was also the author of the *Ecclesiastical Regulation*, which set up the synodal administration of the Russian Church, abolishing the patriarchate. His library contained over three thousand titles. See volume I of *Ways of Russian Theology*, pp. 118-131.

13. F. S. Carpi was an eighteenth-century philosophy professor at the University of Vienna. His textbook *Institutiones philosophiae dogmaticae* was used in the Russian ecclesiastical schools.

14. An important statesman during the reign of Alexander I and also Nicholas I, Mikhail M. Speranskii (1772-1839) served on several commissions to reorganize the ecclesiastical school system. A son of a priest, he himself attended the seminary in St. Petersburg and taught there. He is best known for his legal collections, *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* (1830) and *Svod zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* (1832-1839). A modern study of him is Marc Raeff, *Michael Speransky, Statesmen of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839* (The Hague, 1957).

15. See volume I, pp. 175-181.

16. Filaret (Drozdov, 1783-1867) was the most outstanding Russian Hierarch of the nineteenth century. The Academic Charter was actually provisionally approved in 1809 and introduced experimentally at the St. Petersburg Academy, where Filaret was inspector and a professor, and

from 1812 rector. In 1817 he began his episcopal career, becoming Metropolitan of Moscow in 1821. See volume I, especially chapter V, sections VII and VIII.

17. Ivan Mikhailovich Skvortsov (1795-1863) taught at the St. Petersburg Academy and was a professor of philosophy at the Kiev Academy and professor of theology at Kiev University. His most important work, however, was in the field of canon law. Also useful for the study of this time are his letters to Innokentii Borisov, edited by N. I. Barsov and published in *Trudy Kievskoi Akademii* (1882-1883).

18. Ivan K. Nosov, a graduate of the first class of the reformed St. Petersburg Academy, taught for only two years at the Moscow Academy. At the end of that time, for reasons of illness, he asked permission to leave the school. He subsequently entered civil service, and in 1856 was reported to be a bureaucrat in the state salt administration.

19. Vasilii Iur'evich Kutnevich (1787-1866) at first taught French in the St. Petersburg Academy before moving to Moscow, where he introduced Fedor Golubinskii to the works of Kant, Schelling and Jacobi. He did not teach for too long, however, before embarking on a career in church administration. Kutnevich reached the rank of protopresbyter, the highest priestly rank, served as head chaplain of the armed forces, and in 1849 became a member of the Holy Synod.

20. Fedor Aleksandrovich Golubinskii (1797-1854) was a highly popular professor at Moscow Academy, standing at the center of his own theistic philosophical circle. Although he published almost nothing himself, beginning in 1868 his *Lectures* were printed from the notes of his students.

21. Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi (1743-1819), a German philosopher, was the leading exponent of the "philosophy of feeling" or "belief." His collected works were compiled in six volumes by F. Koppens and published from 1812 to 1825. G. F. Zeiler (1733-1807) was a German theologian who departed somewhat from the accepted teaching of the evangelical church. A polemical writer, his *Kurze Geschichte der Geoffenbarten Religion* was published in 1800. Franz Xavier von Baader (1765-1841), a German theologian, taught philosophy and speculative theology for a time at the University of Munich. Baader expressed his theology in mystical symbols, in the language of Eckhart, Paracelsus and Böhme, and rejected Kantian ethics. He was also influential for his political philosophy, and was particularly liked by mystics and romantics. His *Sämtliche Werke* was published in sixteen volumes (1851-1860).

22. Pierre Poiret (1649-1719) was a French mystic, known for his *L'économie divine* (1687).

23. Christian Clodius (b. 1772) was an adversary of Immanuel Kant. His major work was *Gott in der Natur, in der Menschengeschichte und im Bewußtsein* (1818-1822). He affirmed the primary religious character of human consciousness. All philosophical truths arise from religious feeling.

24. The German mystic Jakob Böhme (1575-1624), who developed a complex and esoteric cosmology, at times dualistic and pantheistic, was first known in Russia through Quirinius Kuhlmann, a mystic and adventurer who resided in Moscow's German Quarter in the late seventeenth century and was put to death for spreading his heresies. Böhme later became immensely popular with the mystics and freemasons of the reigns of Catherine II and Alexander I. Emmanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772), the Swedish scientist and engineer who formulated a neo-Platonic mystical-philosophical system of Christianity on the basis of visions he began to have in the 1740s, was influential among romantics and psychics. His followers organized the New Jerusalem Church in 1787, and it was almost immediately known in Russia.

25. Karl Windischmann (1775-1839) was a German philosopher and a professor at Bonn. A follower of Schelling, one of his better-known works was *Ideen zur Physik*. G. F. Creuzer (1771-1858) was a German philologist and professor at Heidelberg. He wrote numerous studies on the classics, but his chief work was *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1810-1824). Marie-Joseph Degérando (1772-1842) authored several works on epistemology and semantics, including *Des Signes et de l'art de penser, considérés dans leurs rapports mutuels*.

26. Nikolai Ivanovich Nadezhdin (1804-1856) was a Russian critic, journalist, historian and ethnographer. A graduate of Moscow Academy, he taught for a time at Moscow University. From 1831 he was the editor of the journal *Teleskop*, and was exiled in 1836 when the journal was shut down over the Chaadaev affair (see note 34). After working in the provincial administration, Nadezhdin returned and served as editor of the *Journal of the Ministry of Internal Affairs*.

27. The Talmud, from the Hebrew word for "instruction," is a body of traditional rabbinical teaching on civil and religious law, consisting of the Mishna, a collection of laws derived from the Pentateuch, and the Gemara, an interpretation of the Mishna dating from the sixth century. The Kabbala, from the Hebrew word for "accepted tradition," refers to an oral rabbinical tradition that acquired a mystical and occult, theosophic flavor in medieval times.

28. Johann F. von Meyer (1772-1849) was a German theologian, theosophist, and jurist. His interest in freemasonry, the Kabbala, and mysticism is expressed in his *Das Buch Jezira, die älteste, Kabbalistische Urkunde der Hebräer* (1831) and *Zur Aegyptologie* (1840). Andreas-Justinus Kerner (1786-1862) was a German lyrical poet of the Swabian school, and a prominent spiritualist and mystic of the romantic movement. His book *The Seer of Prevorst* (1829) was centered on themes of hypnotism and somnambulism.

29. Count M. V. Tolstoi, "Vospominanie o moei zhizni i uchenii v Sergievskom posade (1825-1830)," *Bogoslovskii Vestnik*, 10-12 (1893). [Author's note].

30. F. Bouterwek (1766-1828) was a professor of theology at Tübingen. In his younger years he was a zealous Kantian, but later became a follower of Jacobi.

31. Fr. Petr Delitsyn (1796-1863) took part in and served as editor of the translation of the Church Fathers from Greek into Russian. A graduate of the Moscow Academy, he taught there for forty-five years.

32. Peter Delitsyn's (1796-1863) translations of the *Aeneid*, Tacitus, Cicero, Goethe and Schiller, like his course materials on algebra, mechanics and mathematical geography, were never published for lack of money, and for many years were kept in the manuscript section of the Moscow Theological Academy library.

33. Delitsyn became editor of the journal *Works of the Holy Fathers in Russian Translation* in 1843. During his years as editor were published the writings of Basil the Great, Ephraem the Syrian, Theodoret of Cyrus, Isidore of Pelusium, Nilus of Sinai, Gregory of Nyssa and Epiphanius.

34. The journal *Teleskop* began publication in 1831 in Moscow. Its biweekly issues featured articles by people of diverse views such as Konstantin Aksakov, Belinskii, Khomiakov, Ogarev, Pogodin, Pushkin, Shevyrev and Zhukovskii. In 1836 *Teleskop* published Petr Chaadaev's "First Philosophical Letter," in which the author denied any value to Russia's history and development and characterized Russia as an alien among the family of modern nations. This article caused a sensation, and was read and discussed through all of the drawing rooms of Moscow and the capital. The government responded quickly, banning further publication of the journal, exiling its editor, Nadezhdin, and by imperial decree Chaadaev was declared insane.

35. Dmitrii Ivanovich Rostislavov (1809-1877), a son of a priest, taught mathematics and physics for many years at St. Petersburg Academy. He gained fame and caused a sensation with several articles on the contemporary state of religious affairs, ecclesiastical education in particular, which were sharply critical and betrayed a distinct Protestant bias. Among them are *O dukhovnykh uchilishchakh*, written on official commission but so controversial that it could only be published abroad (Leipzig, 1860), *Chernoe i beloe dukhovenstvo v Rossii* (1865-1866), and an attack on the wealth of monasteries, *Opyt izsledovaniia ob imushchestvakh i dokhodakh nashikh monastyrei* (St. Petersburg, 1876). His *Notes* [*Zapiski*] were published posthumously in *Russkaia Starina* from 1880 to 1895.

36. Innokentii (1800-1857), a highly influential churchman during the reign of Nicholas I, was best known for his oratorical skills. A graduate of the Kiev Academy, he was a professor and rector of St. Petersburg Academy until 1830, when he returned to Kiev a rector. In 1836 he was made Bishop of Chigirin, and went on to serve the sees of Vologda, Khar'kov, and Kherson. Innokentii left several unpublished works, including *Poslednie dni zemloi zhizni Iisusa Khrista* [*The Last Days of Jesus Christ's Life on Earth*], translated Filaret's *Catechism* into Polish, and was the founder in 1837 of the journal *Voskresenoe Chtenie* [*Sunday Reading*]. His style of teaching and thought is discussed in volume I, pp. 233-235.

37. Louis Herbart (d. 1718) was a French theologian who wrote a book on church antiquities that was often used in early nineteenth-century

ecclesiastical schools. Schad was a professor of philosophy at Khar'kov University from 1811 to 1816 and a follower first of Fichte and then of Schelling. Wilhelm Traugott Krug (1770-1842) was a Kantian philosopher. J. A. L. Wegscheider (1771-1849), a famous Protestant theologian, taught at Halle. His *Institutiones theologiae christianae dogmaticae* was designed to refute Schleiermacher. Karl Bretschneider (1776-1849) was a Protestant theologian who published his *Handbuch der Dogmatik der evangelischen Kirche* in 1838. Ernst-Friedrich Karl Rosenmueller (1768-1835) was a German Lutheran and one of the leading Hebraists of his time. His main works are *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum* (1788-1835), *Handbuch der Biblischen Altertumskunde* (1823-1831), and *Analecta arabica* (1825-1828). Wilhelm M. Leberecht De Wette (1780-1849), a German exegete and theologian, taught at Berlin and wrote several works on dogmatics, chief of which is *System der theologischen Moral* (1847).

38. Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin (1800-1875) was a conservative Russian historian, professor at Moscow University, and editor of the journals *Moskovskii Vestnik* and *Moskvitianin*. His chief works are a seven-volume *Izsledovaniia, zamechaniia i Lektsii o russkoi istorii* (Moscow, 1846-1857) and a three volume *Vrevnaia russkaia istoriia do mongolskogo iga* (Moscow, 1871).

39. Danilo Mikhailovich Vellanskii (D. M. Kavunnik, 1774-1847), an adherent of Schelling's *Naturphilosophie*, was also a prominent scientist and physician. He taught at the St. Petersburg Medical and Surgical Academy. Aleksandr Ivanovich Galich (1783-1848), who also studied in Germany, was a professor of philosophy at the St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute, which later became the University of St. Petersburg. Mikhail Grigor'evich Pavlov (1793-1840), a Schellingian, was the editor of the journal *Athenaeum* and the author of numerous books and articles on philosophy.

40. Fedor Fedorovich Sidonskii (1805-1873) graduated from the seminary in Tver and the St. Petersburg Academy, where he also taught. Mikhail Ivanovich Vladislavlev (1840-1890) studied at the seminary in Novgorod and also in Germany, where he attended lectures by Lotze.

41. Pamfil Danilovich Iurkevich (1827-1874) attended the Poltava Seminary before coming to Kiev, and taught at Moscow University from 1861 until his death, when he was succeeded by Vladimir Solov'ev. Matvei Mikhailovich Troitskii (1835-1899), the son of a deacon, was professor of philosophy first in Kazan and then in Warsaw before coming to Moscow.

42. Feofan (Petr Semenovich Avsenev, 1812-1852) taught German language and literature and then philosophy at the Kiev Academy, served as inspector there, and was also a professor at Kiev University. Shortly before his death he became the pastor of the church in the Russian embassy in Rome. Orest Markovich Novitskii (1806-1884) was a professor at Kiev University. S. S. Gogotskii (1813-1889), a Hegelian, taught philosophy at Kiev University.

43. Iosif Grigorovich Mikhnevich (1809-1885) was a graduate of the Kiev Academy and taught there and at the Lycée Richelieu. The Lycée

Richelieu, named after the governor-general of Odessa, Duke Armand-Emmanuel de Plessis de Richelieu, was founded in 1816 by a French priest, Carl Eugene Nicole, and was operated by Jesuits until 1820. Thereafter it became the chief school in Russia south of Kiev.

44. Platon Aleksandrovich Shirinskii-Shikhmatov (1790-1853) was known as both a political and a literary reactionary (he was a disciple of Shishkov). He began to work for the ministry in 1824, during Magnitskii's similar attacks on the "rebellious science" of philosophy, and headed the ministry from 1850 until his death. He was also head of the St. Petersburg Archeographic Commission.

45. A graduate of Moscow Academy, Viktor Dmitrievich Kudriavtsev (1828-1892) also served as a tutor to the royal family. He wrote a great deal, and his textbook *Elements of Philosophy* went through four editions.

46. A. I. Vvedenskii (1856-1925) was a graduate of St. Petersburg University and a leading neo-Kantian. He was also a professor at St. Petersburg University and was president of the St. Petersburg Philosophical Society.

47. G. H. Schubert was a nineteenth-century German philosopher. His *Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Natur* was a popular book among Russian students of philosophy.

48. See volumes VII to X of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky.*

49. His influence on the so-called Cyril and Methodius circle should be noted. [Author's note].

50. From a contemporary necrology. [Author's note].

51. Vasilii Nikolaevich Karpov (1798-1867) was a philosopher of the Idealist tradition. He taught philosophy at Kiev Academy and became professor of philosophy at St. Petersburg Academy in 1833. The second, complete edition of his translation of Plato was published between 1863 and 1879. He also wrote an *Introduction to Philosophy* (St. Petersburg, 1840).

52. *The Gradual Development of Ancient Philosophical Doctrines in Relation to the Development of Pagan Religions* [*Postepennoe razvitie drevnikh filosofskikh uchenii v sviazi s razvitiem iazycheskikh verovanie*], 4 vols. (1860-1862). [Author's note].

53. Vladimir Sergeevich Solov'ev (1853-1900), the son of the famous historian, was a Russian religious philosopher who had a great influence on Russian intellectuals, poets, artists, philosophers, and theologians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In his youth he was infected with the positivist ideas current at the time, and entered Moscow University as a student of natural sciences. Soon, however, his thoughts turned decisively to religious problematics, and he became one of the rare university students who attended lectures at Moscow Academy. His first major work, *The Crisis of Western Philosophy* (1874), marked him as a Slavophile and Schellingian, and won for him Iurkevich's chair at the

university (Iurkevich died that year). Solov'ev did not teach for too long before embarking on a long trip abroad, where he studied and became drawn to mystical and theosophic works, in particular the Kabbala and Böhme. On his return he wrote his *Critique of Abstract Principles* (1880) and delivered his celebrated *Lectures on God-Manhood* (1881). The year 1881 also marked a great crisis in his life. Up to this time he had believed in the theocratic calling of the Russian tsar, who was to bring about the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. After the assassination of Alexander II on March 1/13, Solov'ev called upon the new tsar to demonstrate his superior Christian principles by forgiving the culprits. Instead, Solov'ev was forbidden to give public lectures and thereafter could publish in Russia only with great difficulty. Solov'ev, disillusioned, was forced to abandon his Slavophile leanings and look to the West, seeing his main task as the unification of the Christian churches under the Pope of Rome. During this period in his life he drew close to an older form of Catholic Slavophilism, represented by the Croatian Bishop Strossmayer. Solov'ev's next major works were published abroad: *The History and Future of Theocracy* (Zagreb, 1887); *L'idée russe* (Paris, 1888); and *La Russie et l'église universelle* (Paris, 1889). Upon the failure of the pope to concern himself with Solov'ev's and Strossmayer's cause, Solov'ev turned in the 1890s to more mystical, artistic and apocalyptical themes, finding himself more and more isolated both in Russia and in the West. Solov'ev's thought and influence is discussed below in section 11 of this chapter, section 7 of chapter VII and section 2 of chapter VIII.

54. Mikhail Ivanovich Karinskii (1840-1917) graduated from Moscow Academy in 1862, taught at the St. Petersburg Academy from 1869 to 1894, and wrote extensively on the history of ancient philosophy.

55. Aleksandr S. Sturdza (1791-1854) was one of the leaders of a conservative Orthodox reaction to the western mystical and intellectual influences that abounded in the time of Alexander I. A Moldavian noble - man by birth, he was raised in Russia, educated in Germany, and had a long career as a diplomat for the Russian government. He was also an active writer on political and religious themes. While working in the Russian embassy in Paris in 1815, he wrote his best-known work, *Considérations sur la doctrine et l'ésprit de L'église orthodoxe*, which proved very controversial.

56. N. V. Stankevich (1813-1840) was the leader of the famous and brilliant philosophical circle of the 1830s that included Belinskii, K. Aksakov, Bakunin and Granovskii. See Edward J. Brown, *Stankevich and His Moscow Circle, 1830-1840* (Stanford, 1966).

57. From a letter to M. Bakunin, November 7, 1835. [Author's note].

58. The first great, modern Russian literary figure, Aleksandr Pushkin (1799-1837) set a poetic standard for all later Russian literature in such works as *Eugene Onegin*, *Ruslan and Ludmilla*, and *The Captain's Daughter*, as well as in his numerous shorter poems. Pushkin was edu - cated and lived his early years as a high-society nobleman of St. Peters - burg, and was fully exposed to the western and romantic influences of those years. At the Tsarskoe Lycée, where he was educated, his teachers included two prominent idealists — Kunitsyn and Galich.

59. Aleksandr Ivanovich Herzen (1812-1870) was a Russian radical journalist, philosopher and literary critic. Most of his activity, however, took place in London, where he published the journal *Kolokol* [*The Bell*]. Herzen left extensive memoirs of this time, *Byloe i Dumy* [English translation: *My Past and Thoughts*, 6 vol., (New York, 1924-1928)].

60. Lorenz Oken (1779-1855) was a German biologist and philosopher. After several academic appointments (Jena, Basel and Munich), he became professor of physiology in Zürich. His most important work is *Lehrbuch der Naturphilosophie*, 3 vols., (Jena, 1808-1811).

61. John Locke (1632-1704), the "father of English empiricism," was trained in scholastic philosophy at Oxford, and also occupied himself with experimental chemistry, meteorology, and medicine, as well as mixing in English politics. His main work, which took seventeen years to complete, was *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), in which he attempted to break away from Aristotelianism and define what matters, in science, religion and philosophy, are within the human grasp and what is beyond it. Étienne Bonnot de Condillac (1715-1780), a French philosopher and psychologist, endeavored to systematize Locke's principles. His somewhat atheistic and deterministic thought is represented in such works as *Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines* (1746); *Traité des systèmes* (1749); and *Traité des sensations* (1754).

62. Vissarion Grigor'evich Belinskii (1811-1848) was an important and influential literary critic and journalist, who at one time or another was associated with almost all of the major intellectual figures of his day. A student at Moscow University, he was expelled in 1832 for his revolutionary-democratic views, but continued to frequent Stankevich's circle, where he studied Kant, Fichte and Schelling. He also studied Hegel with his good friend Bakunin. Belinskii was the main critic for the journal *Teleskop* and for *Molva*, its literary supplement, espousing the cause of literary realism. Later he edited the journal *Moskovskii nabliudatel'* [*Moscow Observer*] and wrote for *Otechestvennye zapiski* and *Sovremennik*.

63. Dmitrii Venevitinov was already an established literary figure when he died at the age of twenty-two. He is generally considered the main inspiration and most important member of this circle, serving as its secretary. His writings, preserved only in fragments, were collected and published in Moscow in 1934.

64. On Odoevskii, see note 9 and below, section V.

65. A. I. Koshelev (1806-1856) was a close friend of Kireevskii. His *Memoirs* [*Zapiski*] were published in 1889.

66. Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), a Dutch Jew, developed a philosophy based on the idea of an impersonal rational order in the universe, which has sometimes been termed pantheism. His chief works are *Ethica* (1677); *Tractatus de intellectus emandatione* (1677); and *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (1670).

67. Cf. Koshelev's "History of the Conversion of Ivan Vasil'evich," written on the basis of what Kireevskii's wife told him. One should also compare this with 'religious renunciation' in the history of German romanticism. [Author's note]. On Koshelev's "History" see section V in this chapter.

68. The literary critic Stefan Shevyrev (1806-1846) and the historian Pogodin (see note 38) were representatives of the conservative and nationalist "official ideology" of Nicholas I's reign. V. K. Kukhel'beker (1797-1846), a Decembrist, was a poet and critic. S. E. Raich (1792-1855) was an educator and journalist who organized his own philosophical circle in 1823.

69. Nikolai Polevoi (1796-1846) was a well-known literary critic and historian. From 1825 to 1834 he was the editor of the journal *Moskovskii Telegraf* [*Moscow Telegraph*], which was devoted to French and German romantic literature. His main historical work is his *History of the Russian People* (1828-1830), in which, as the title suggests, he related Russian history in terms of the life of the people rather than in terms of political institutions.

70. Victor Cousin (1792-1867) was the most renowned French thinker of his time. Although his thought was basically continuous with that of Locke and Condillac, he also showed the influence of Hegel and Schelling, and in his many writings and lectures he shifted the tenor of French philosophy from the materialistic to the idealistic. His main works are *Fragments philosophiques* (1826); *De la Metaphysique d'Aristote* (1835); and *Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien* (1836).

71. Aleksandr Herzen and the revolutionary, social critic and poet Nikolai Platonovich Ogarev (1808-1877) formed their circle while they were both students at Moscow University. This group was broken up by the government in 1834, and the following year its members were exiled.

72. For an extended discussion of Saint-Simonism and its influence on Herzen, see chapter six of Martin Malia's *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism* (New York: Grosset and Dunlop, 1961), pp. 99-133.

73. Although not popular in his lifetime, the ideas of Saint-Simon (Claude Henri de Rouvroy, 1760-1825) provided much of the inspiration of the utopian socialists of the last three-quarters of the nineteenth century. Reacting against the excesses of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, Saint-Simon thought that society should be led by industrialists, with men of science controlling its spiritual direction. His chief work, in which he developed his system almost into a religion, was *Nouveau Christianisme* (1825).

74. Lorenz von Stein's *Socialism and Communism in Contemporary France* influenced many Russian intellectuals of this period, including Iurii Samarin.

75. One should note the correspondence between Herzen and his wife Natasha, that remarkable monument of romantic experience. [Author's note].

76. A. L. Witberg (1787-1855), a freemason, was a painter and architect commissioned by Alexander I to build the never-to-be-completed Cathedral of Christ the Savior in commemoration of the defeat of Napoleon. He was later exiled to Siberia for alleged mismanagement of funds for the project, and there met Herzen.

77. Karl von Ekhartshausen (1752-1803) was a prolific Bavarian writer on themes of mysticism and alchemy. He was never very widely known in Western Europe, but in his lifetime I. V. Lopukhin translated his works into Russian and he became immensely popular with Russian mystics and freemasons.

78. The theory of animal magnetism originated with Friedrich Anton Mesmer (1733-1815), who believed that illnesses could be cured with the use of magnets. See Vincent Buranelli, *The Wizard from Vienna* (New York, 1975).

79. Aleksandr Ivanovich Odoevskii (1802-1839), a nobleman, was exiled to Siberia in 1827 for his part in the 1825 insurrection. He returned in 1837 and became known as a poet. *The Imitation of Christ*, often attributed to Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471), is a universally popular classic of devotional literature. When it was written in the Middle Ages, religious life was dominated by sophisticated, speculative scholasticism. The appearance of this book turned spiritual attitudes toward greater emphasis on personal asceticism, the reading of Holy Scripture, meditation on the life of Christ, and intellectual simplicity.

80. Note the emotional reunion of the two friends in Vladimir, in front of the crucifix. [Author's note].

81. P. N. Sakulin, *Kniaz V. F. Odoevskii* (Moscow, 1913).

82. In this connection, one should note the later "Petrashevskii Circle." [Author's note]. Mikhail Butashevich-Petrashevskii, a graduate of the Tsarskoe Selo Lycée, organized his circle in the 1840s. The group held regular meetings in St. Petersburg, usually taken up with discussion of western utopian socialists such as Saint-Simon, Proudhon, and especially Fourier, and also debated how Russia could be changed to conform with these ideals. In a period of reaction following the French revolution of 1848, this circle, which included Dostoevskii, was disbanded, and its members were arrested, subjected to a mock execution, and deported to Siberia.

83. Cf. Herzen's account of this "theoretical split" in volume II of *Byloe i dumy*. [Author's note].

84. Belinskii's letter has been translated into English by Valentine Snow and is included in Marc Raeff's *Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology* (New York, 1966), pp. 253-261.

85. Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766-1826) was one of the most important and influential literary figures of his age. In his early career he was known as a poet and novelist, then became famous for his *Letters of a Russian Traveler* (1791-1792), an account of a journey through Western

Europe written in the sentimental style. After 1803, when he was appointed court historian, he devoted his activity to historical research, producing two famous works: *Mémoir on Ancient and Modern Russia* (1811) and the twelve-volume *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago* (1819-1826). Both works represented patriotic and conservative justifications of autocratic government in Russia, and were highly important in that they marked the first serious attempts to give an account of Russian history. They were equally important for the style in which they were written, marking a significant advance toward the modern Russian literary language.

86. Petr Iakovlevich Chaadaev (1794-1856) attended Moscow University and served in the military in the Napoleonic campaigns, which provided him with direct contact with the West. He began writing his *"Philosophical Letters"* in French in 1829. The publication of the first of them, which violently criticized Russia's history and culture, caused a scandal in 1836, and the author was declared insane by imperial decree. There are two English translations of his works: Mary-Barbara Zeldin, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1969) and Raymond T. McNally, *The Major Works of Peter Chaadaev* (Notre Dame Press, 1969).

87. Louis Bonald (1754-1840) was a French writer and philosopher who defended traditional monarchy and religion. Pierre Ballanche, a late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century democratic Catholic, preached the idea of *palingénesie sociale*, or social rebirth. This idea, along with Saint-Simon's "New Christianity," found favorable reception in Russia in the 1830s. Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) combined a reactionary political philosophy with freemasonic mysticism. He lived in St. Petersburg from 1803 to 1817, for a time was a friend and advisor to Alexander I, and had great influence in Russian society, particularly through such works as *Les Soirées de St. Petersburg* and *Du Pape* (1819).

88. Adolphe Circourt (1801-1879) was a French publicist. Baron Nicholas d'Eckstein (1790-1861), a French publicist and philosopher, was also a great traveler and popularized Asian literature in France.

89. Aleksandr Ivanovich Turgenev (1785-1846) served in Russia as the head of the Department of Foreign Confessions and also directed "spiritual affairs" in the "combined ministry." He traveled extensively and did a great deal of historical work in collecting materials on Russia in foreign archives.

90. A physician and economist by training, Johann Heinrich Jung (1740-1817), ("Stilling" from the pietist idea of *Stille* or 'inner peace'," was a freemasonic addition to his name) became widely known throughout Europe for his mystical writings. His chief idea was of a millenium to be ushered in by a new Church, a higher form of mystical Christianity. Jung-Stilling was one of the most popular western mystics in Russia during the Alexandrian period.

91. Sofiia Sergeevna Meshcherskaia (1775-1848) was active in the Russian Bible Society, worked to improve conditions in the St. Petersburg prisons, and organized a pietist publishing enterprise, which attracted the support of Alexander I.

92. Cf. Odoevskii's *Russian Nights*. [Author's note].

93. The positivist historian Pavel Gavrilovich Vinogradov (1854-1925) was a professor both at Moscow University and at Oxford in England, specializing in the study of medieval Europe. He ended his life as a British subject.

94. See the following chapter.

95. See the very characteristic exchange of opinions precisely on the personality between Kavelin and Iurii Samarin, in articles published in 1847. [Author's note]. K. D. Davelin (1818-1845) was a noted Russian liberal and professor at St. Petersburg University.

96. The philosophical system of August Comte (1798-1857) represented an attempt to reorganize and reintegrate society through the application of scientific principles in the realms of morality, politics and religion. Comte's chief work was *Cours de philosophie positive* (1839-1842), and he also carried on a correspondence with J. S. Mill, wrote a *System of Positive Polity* (1851-1854), and compiled a "Positive Calendar," in which the traditional saints were replaced by the names of people who had helped to advance civilization.

97. See Schelling's *Kirche als lebendiges Kunstwerk* [Author's note].

98. Konstantin Sergeevich Aksakov (1817-1860), publicist, historian, philologist and poet, had studied at Moscow University and took part in the Stankevich circle. In the 1840s and 1850s he was one of the most prominent Slavophile leaders. The essay quoted below can be found in an English translation in Raeff,*Russian Intellectual History*, pp. 230251.

99. On Berdiaev, see below, chapter eight, section six.

100. Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804-1860) is the best known of the Slavophile leaders in the West. See below in this chapter, section VII.

101. "Strip-system" [*cherezpolositsa*] refers to the practice of allotting each peasant family in a village communal strips of land from the common acreage.

102. Iurii Samarin (1819-1876) was a statesman and Slavophile ideologue. See below, section VIII.

103. V. V. Rozanov, "Zametki o vazhneishikh techeniiakh russkoi filosofskoi mysli," *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1890.

104. *The European* began publication in January of 1832 but only two issues were published before the government banned it. See the essay by L. G. Frizman, "K istorii zhurnala 'Evropeets'," *Russkaia Literatura*, no. 2 (1967), pp. 117-126.

105. Ivan Vladimirovich Lopukhin (1756-1816) was a prominent Russian Freemason. He was active in the translation and publication of western

mystical works, was grand master of a lodge in Moscow in Moscow, engaged in educational and philanthropical work, and served in the governments of Paul and Alexander I. Lopukhin authored a defense of freemasons in Russia, *Nravouchitel'nyi katekhizis istinnykh franmasonov* (1790), as well as his *Nekotoryia cherty o vnutrennei tserkvi, o edinom puti istiny i o razlichnykh putiakh zabliuzhdeniia i gibel'* [*Several Characteristics of the Inner Church, of the One Path to the Truth, and the Various Paths to Error and Damnation*] (St. Petersburg, 1798).

106. On Zhukovskii, see note 4. Gavriil Batenkov (1793-1863) was a Decembrist and a close assistant of Speranskii during the latter's administration of Siberia. When the Decembrists were allowed to return from Siberian exile, Batenkov, in 1856, settled for a time on the estate of his old friends the Elagin-Kireevskiis.

107. Nikolai Ivanovich Novikov (1744-1818) was a leading publisher, writer, educator, and philanthropist of the last third of the eighteenth century. His first publishing venture was a series of satirical journals put out in St. Petersburg, while at the same time he was compiling valuable bibliographic materials on old Russian literature. Although he became a freemason at this time, he did not share the mystical enthusiasms that came to typify the period. In 1779 Novikov moved to Moscow and opened his Typographical Company, which in the ten years of its existence was one of the most productive publishing firms in Russia, specializing in translations of western freemasons and mystics. In 1792, the Empress Catherine turned against the Russian freemasons and Novikov was arrested and confined to his estate.

108. François Fénelon (1651-1715) was a French theologian, educator and bishop. He authored several mystical tracts that were especially popular with sentimentalists and deists. He was widely popular in Russia in the eighteenth century. Jean-Baptiste Massillon (1663-1742), French pedagogue and bishop, was a renowned preacher in his day. Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre (1737-1814), a writer and a sociologist, developed a sentimental philosophy in *Études de la Nature* (1784). Alfred de Vigny (1799-1863) was a pioneer of the French romantic movement, best known for his novel *Cinq Mars* (1836).

109. Jean Paul was a pseudonym for Freidrich Richter (1763-1825), the well-known German sentimentalist. His most important work, *Titan* (1800-1803) was the story of a German prince, who grows up not knowing who he is and who must become the benefactor of the country where he is fated to rule. Titan was a protest against the *Sturm und Drang* movement. E. T. A. Hoffmann (1776-1822), the famous German Romantic, wrote tales dwelling on the theme of man's sacrilegious aspiration to dethrone God and substitute himself in God's place. He had enormous influence on Russian Romantics, especially the young Dostoevsky.

110. Kireevski's step-father was Aleksei Andreevich Elagin. Kireevskii's mother, née Avdot'ia Petrovna Iushkova (1789-1877), married him in 1817. She was one of the best educated women of her day; she was taught German language and literature by Zhukovskii, her uncle. The second

marriage to Elagin brought her to Moscow, where her salon became a leading literary center.

111. Claude-Adrien Helvetius (1715-1771) was a controversial French *philosophe*, who exhibited a marked hedonist bent. His chief work was *De l'ésprit* (1758), in which he denied any religious basis for morality.

112. Dugald Stewart (1753-1828) was a Scottish philosopher and principal exponent of the philosophy of common sense. Thomas Reid (1710-1796) was the first advocate of the "Scottish School" of common sense philosophy. Adam Ferguson (1723-1816) was a Scottish man of letters, philosopher, historian and patriot. Adam Smith (1723-1790), the famous Scottish economist, authored *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776).

113. Little is known about Filaret, a *starets* or elder of the Novospaskii monastery. He had been a disciple of Afanasii (Zakharov) of the Ploshchansk hermitage. Afanasii's other students included the later elder (*starets*) Makarii (1788-1860) of the Optino hermitage. Makarii was a close collaborator with Ivan Kireevskii.

114. Makarii, born Mikhail Ivanov, was a nobleman who became a monk in 1815 and lived at Optina from 1834, becoming a *starets* and superior there. He died in 1860. His *Sobranie pisem* [*Collected Letters*] was published in Moscow in 1862. On Makarii, see especially V. Lossky, "Le *Starets* Macaire," *Contacts*, no. 27 (1962), pp. 9-19.

115. Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher (1768-1834), the famous German Protestant theologian, taught at the University of Berlin after 1810. In his work *The Christian Faith* (1821-1822) he tried to reconcile modern social theories and evangelical religious beliefs.

116. Claude de Saint-Martin (1743-1803) was one of the leaders of the late eighteenth-century anti-rationalist movement. His *Des erreur et de la verité* (1775) was quickly translated into Russian and served as a basic mystical handbook. Saint-Martin became so popular in Russia that Russian freemasons were known as "Martinists." John Pordage (1608-1698), an English astrologer and mystic, was known for his works *Theologia mystica* (1680); *Mystica divinitia* (1683); and *Metaphysica veva et divina* (1698).

117. Compare with Chaadaev and also with Polevoi's *History of the Russian People* [*Istoriia russkago naroda*]. The idea apparently comes from Maistre. [Author's note].

118. The essay is subtitled "A Letter to Count E. E. Komarovskii." Its publication led to a repression of Slavophile writings. An English translation by Valentine Snow is included in Raeff, *Russian Intellectual History*, pp. 174-207.

119. Makarii (Bulgakov, 1816-1882) was one of the most important Russian ecclesiastical figures of the nineteenth century. He taught at the Kiev Academy and later at the St. Petersburg Academy, where he was rector. His episcopal career, which began in 1857, brought him to the sees of Tambov, Khar'kov, and Lithuania before he became Metropolitan

of Moscow in 1879. Makarii's *Introduction to Theology*, published in 1847, was his doctoral dissertation, and also served as the first part of his five-volume *Dogmatic Theology* [*Bogoslovie dogmaticheskoe*, 1849]. He also published a massive work on Russian church history and a history of the Raskol.

120. Antonii Amfiteatrov (1815-1879) was at one time rector of the Kiev Academy and subsequently served as Archbishop of Kazan. His *Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie*, which was published in 1849, was a most conservative work that avoided both scholasticism and modern philosophy. See volume I of *Ways of Russian Theology*, pp. 256-258.

121. Filaret Drozdov. See note 16.

122. See vol. I, pp. 82-83 for St. Dimitrii of Rostov.

123. St. Tikhon (1724-1783) wrote two main theological works, *On True Christianity*, based on his lectures when he was a professor at the seminary in Novgorod, and *A Spiritual Treasure Collected from the World.* His complete works – *Tvoreniia* – were published in five volumes (Moscow, 1898-1899).

124. Nicholas Gogol (1809-1853) was one of Russia's greatest writers. His most famous novel, *Dead Souls*, was written in two parts: *Inferno* (Part I) and *Purgatorio* (Part II). The second part, never successfully written, was inspired by Gogol's religious crisis of 1842-1843, an event which led to his controversial *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* (1847), a work which drew the wrath of the Russian literary critic Vissarion Belinskii in his celebrated *Letter to Gogol.* In Belinskii's view, Gogol's work defended obscurantism.

125. See note 68.

126. Princess Volkonskaia, whom Gogol had met in 1838, had been secretly converted to Catholicism in 1829. Gogol was a frequent visitor at her villa Palazzo Poli, outside of Rome. The Order of the Resurrection, or Congregation of the Resurrection, was founded by Polish émigrés in Rome in 1833, and a branch was soon established in Paris by the poet Mickiewicz, one of the original founders of the order. Its purpose, among others, was to promote education and aid for Polish émigrés. The headquarters of the order are still in Rome.

127. Adam Mickiewicz (1798-1855), Poland's greatest poet, lived in Russia as an exile from 1824 to 1829. After that he settled in western Europe.

128. Joseph Vielgorskii, the son of Count Mikhail Vielgorskii and Countess Luisa, became Gogol's closest friend in Rome in 1838. He died a year later. Gogol's description of his feelings during Joseph's last days is recorded in *Nights at a Villa.* There were also two sisters, Sofiia, who married the writer Vladimir Sologub, and Anna, to whom Gogol became greatly attached. Aleksandra Smirnova, a lady-in-waiting to the empress, was one of Gogol's closest confidants, and it seems that he functioned as her spiritual guide.

129. Jean Baptiste Henri Lacordaire (1802-1861) was a French Roman Catholic preacher who sided with the Republic in 1848. Gustave François Xavier de Ravignan (1795-1858) was a popular Jesuit orator who in 1836 succeeded Lacordaire in the pulpit of Notre Dame.

130. Aleksandra Osipovna Smirnova (1809-1882) was a writer and a friend of the empresses Maria Fedorovna and Alexandra Fedorovna. She frequented St. Petersburg literary circles and befriended Pushkin, Lermontov, Zhukovskii, Gogol and other prominent writers of the period. Part of Gogol's *Selected Correspondence* is addressed to her.

131. Silvio Pelliko was an early nineteenth-century Italian moralist, liberal and nationalist, imprisoned for his views in 1821.

132. Fr. Matvei Konstantinovskii, a priest in Rzhev, became Gogol's confessor and acquired strong influence over him beginning in 1847. Apparently he urged Gogol to become a monk.

133. Compare the book's influence on A. A. Ivanov. [Auhor's note]. A. A. Ivanov (1806-1858) was a Russian painter. His painting "Christ Appears to the People" produced a profound effect on Gogol, who includes a fragment in his *Selected Correspondence* ("The Historical Painter Ivanov") where he discusses the painter and his work.

134. Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) was a French preacher, writer, and defender of Gallicanism against Protestantism and against the Quietism championed by Fénelon. His *Oeuvres Philosophique* includes the celebrated instruction to the Dauphin, entitled *Political Doctrine Drawn from the Holy Scripture,* a vigorous defense of divine-right monarchy.

135. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*. The misspelling is Gogol's.

136. The books were sent to him from Russia, but some were given to him by the Parisian archpriest, Fr. D. Vershinskii, a former teacher at the St. Petersburg Academy. [Author's note].

137. Jacques Goar (1601-1653), a renowned historian of Eastern liturgies, published his *Euchologium seu rituale graecorum* in Paris in 1647. It contains what is still regarded as the most authoritative version of the texts of the sacraments in Greek, along with a parallel Latin translation.

138. *A Historical and Sacramental Explanation of the Divine Liturgy* [*Istoricheskoe i tainstvennoe ob'iasnenie bozhestvennoi liturgii*], first issued in 1804, was a long-time standard work on liturgical theology. In *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Bangor, Maine, 1966), p. 10, Alexander Schmemann refers to its author, Professor Dmitrievskii of the Moscow Academy, as something of a "Russian Goar."

139. See above, vol. I, p. 277, note 49.

140. See above, vol. I, pp. 9-11 and 276, note 47 for St. Maxim; pp. 23 and 156-161 and 282, note 95 for the *Philokalia*, Paisii, and St. Tikhon. St. John Chrysostom (c. 345-407), the "Golden Mouthed," one of the greatest preachers of the Orthodox Church, often spoke against the

prevailing mores of Greco-Roman life, including horse-racing, popular farces, and pantomimes. Ephraem the Syrian, the powerful fourth-century preacher, wrote many of the hymns used for liturgical purposes. See volume VII of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky* for chapters on both Chrysostom and Ephraem [*The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*].

141. Stefan Iavorskii (1658-1722), the nominal head of the Russian Orthodox Church during most of the reign of Peter the Great, had been a professor at the Kiev Academy and a noted orator. His writings and sermons show a marked Roman Catholic influence. Lazar Baranovich (c. 1620-1693), a noted seventeenth-century Ukrainian poet, preacher, and anti-Catholic polemist, was rector of the Kiev Collegium and Archbishop of Chernigov. On his works see volume I, p. 107. On Dimitrii of Rostov see above, note 122.

142. On Innokentii Borisov, see note 36. Iakov Vecherkov (d. 1850) was Bishop of Saratov and later of Nizhni-Novgorod. He devoted considerable effort to winning sectarians back to the Church.

143. Cf. M. O. Gershenzon, "Zaveshchanie Gogolia," *Russkaia Mysl'* (May, 1909).

144. The Holy Alliance, presented to Europe by Emperor Alexander I in 1815, bound its subscribers to conduct themselves according to a mystical, monarchical principle based on Christian morality. Alexander formulated this "alliance" in the wake of his victory over Napoleon, when he was convinced that God's deliverance of Russia from this enemy was a summons to him to carry out some special mission. The alliance itself had no practical significance and came only to symbolize extreme reaction in a time of revolutionary activity throughout Europe.

145. In 1817 the religious and educational departments in the Russian imperial government were merged into a dual Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Education, headed by Alexander I's long-time friend and advisor, the freemason A. N. Golitsyn. The "Combined Ministry" provided Golitsyn with enormous power in society and signified a virtual government dictatorship over intellectual life, heavily favoring western mystical and pietist trends. It was disbanded by Nicholas I.

146. See above, note 133.

147. Ignatii Brianchaninov (1807-1867), a man of a severe ascetic temperament, was for a long time head of the Sergiev *pustin'* outside of St. Petersburg and then Bishop of Stavropol. See below in chapter VII. Grigorii Postnikov (d. 1860) was rector of the St. Petersburg Academy, where he founded the journal *Khristianskoe chtenie.* A well-known religious writer, he was Metropolitan of St. Petersburg from 1855.

148. *The New Table of Commandments* (Moscow, 1804) was written by Veniamin Rumovskii (d. 1811), the Archbishop of Nizhni-Novgorod. A very popular book in its time, it went through several editions.

149. This was omitted by the censorship from the first edition. [Author's note].

150. Felicité Robert de Lammenais (1782-1854), a French Roman Catholic, opposed Gallicanism. His *Paroles d'un Croyant* (1834) espoused instead a liberal humanism.

151. B. N. Chicherin, in *Vospominaniia, Moskva sorokovykh godov* (Moscow, 1929), admits that Khomiakov had a skillful mind but considers this only logical gymnastics. [Author's note].

152. Pavel Florenskii (b. 1882), a Russian philosopher, theologian and scientist, repeats in his own writings Khomiakov's doctrine of *Sobornost'* as a principle of Church organization. On Florenskii, see below, chapter eight, section six.

153. Sergei Mikhailovich Solov'ev (1820-1879), the father of the philosopher, taught at Moscow University for many years and was the author of a monumental, twenty-nine volume *History of Russia from Ancient Times* (Moscow, 1851-1879). The title of his autobiographical notes is *Moi zapiski dlia detei moikh, a, esli mozhno, i dlia drugikh* (St. Petersburg, no date).

154. The word *byt*, translated here as "custom" or "customary life," is an untranslatable term, but in the ideological controversies of the nineteenth century it was often said that the reforms of Peter the Great divided the nation into two parts: the educated upper elite and the masses whose lives remained relics of Old Russia and were denoted by the term *byt*. [Translator's note].

155. On Florenskii, see below, chapter VIII, section six.

156. Herzen, as was the custom in such writings, refers to himself in the third person. Johann August Wilhelm Neander (1789-1850) was a Jew who converted to Christianity and became a famous church historian. Several of his histories, including his five-volume *General History of the Christian Religion*, are available in English translation. August Friedrich Gfroerer (1803-1861) was a German historian and the leader of German ultramontanism. His greatest work was his *Papst Gregorius VII und sein Zeitalter*, 7 vols. (Schaffhausen, 1859-1861).

157. Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1839), church historian and theologian, was the leader of the so-called "Catholic School" at the University of Tübingen. His four most famous works are *Die Einheit in der Kirche* (1825); *Athanasius der Grosse* (1827); *Symbolik* (1832); and *Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgegensätze zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten* (1834).

158. On Maistre, see above, vol I, p. 168 and p. 350, note 30. François René de Chateaubriand (1768-1848), the famous French writer and politician, became after 1800 the most brilliant member of a circle of social and religious reformers. His most famous work was *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe* (begun in 1803, published posthumously). On Bonald, see above, this chapter, note 87. Charles Montalembert (1810-1870), a liberal Catholic historian and orator, tried to reconcile liberal politics with an ardent Catholic faith. Under the Romantic influence of Joseph von Görres and others of the Munich school, he produced his well-known

volumes of history written in a Catholic spirit and with great enthusiasm for the Middle Ages. These include *Histoire de Sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie* (1836) and *Les Moines de l'Occident* (7 vols., 1860-1877).

159. Jean-Baptiste Bordas-Demoulin (1798-1859) was a French philosopher. Ernst Sartorius (1797-1859) was a German Lutheran theologian who taught at the University of Dorpat from 1824 to 1835, during which time he wrote his attack on rationalism, *Beiträge zur Verteidigung der evangelischen Rechtgläubigkeit* (Heidelberg, 1825-1826).

160. One must take into account not so much Möhler's *Symbolik* as his earlier book on the Church. [Author's note].

161. It is not clear which clergymen read Khomiakov's *Opyt'* (*Ispovedanie*) in manuscript, but, in his own words, "All those who read it agreed that it was completely Orthodox and only its format is unsuitable and doubtful." Obviously this was Metropolitan Filaret. During the 1840s relations between Filaret and Khomiakov were good and the metropolitan listened with particular sympathy to Khomiakov's stories about England, its religious life, and contemporary aspirations. [Author's note].

162. This understanding of *sobornost'* should be compared with that of Vladimir Solov'ev in his *Spiritual Foundations of Life* [*Dukhovnye osnovy zhizni*]. [Author's note].

163. Prince S. N. Trubetskoi, in contrast, emphasized that "the theology of Khomiakov and his followers did not correspond to the ancient norms of Orthodoxy and contained a deviation from it, but in a Roman Catholic direction: an exaggerated teaching about the Church, transforming it into a basic dogma of religious doctrine." *Sobrannoe sochinenie*, vol. I, pp. 445-446. [Author's note].

164. Donatism was a fourth-century schismatic movement, with roots further back into African Christianity, that divided the Church in North Africa. The Donatists had a very rigorist and exclusive view of the Church, holding that apostates and other major sinners could not repent and rejoin the body of Christ. The schism had started when the new bishop of Carthage consecrated in 312 was found to have been consecrated by a bishop who had fallen in the Diocletian persecution and then repented. The Donatists refused to recognize him and refused to maintain communion with anyone who did, or the entire Orthodox Church.

165. Josephinism refers to the Austrian system of Church-State relations, constructed in the eighteenth century as part of the Enlightenment. Joseph II's vigorous implementation of this system gave it its name, but it was put in practice as early as the 1760s, in the measures adopted by Prince Kaunitz and Maria Theresa to bring the Church more firmly under state control. Frebronianism was a theory constructed by Justinus Febronius (Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim) in his *De praesenti statu Ecclesiae deque legitima postestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis* (1763). Hontheim intended to expose the papacy and urge the pope to return to the spirit of primitive Christianity. Febronianism was condemned in 1764 by Pope Clement XIII.

166. The University of Tübingen was located in Württemberg and included areas of Catholic population after Württemberg became a kingdom in 1806. In 1817, as a result, the university acquired two new faculties, political science and Catholic theology, with five chairs. A "Catholic School" quickly formed with J. A. Möhler as its leading representative. Johann Sebastian Drey (1777-1853) was a systematic theologian and historian of dogma, and in 1819 one of the founders of the *Tübinger theologische Quartalschrift*. Johann Hirscher (1788-1865) wrote extensively on preaching, moral theology, and the catechism. His *Katechismus der christkatholischen Religion* (1842) was a very popular work. Franz Anton Staudenmayer (1800-1856) was a well-known Catholic dogmatician and professor of Catholic history. His published works include *Die christliche Dogmatik*, 4 vols. (Freiburg, 1844-1852) and *Encyclopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Mainz, 1834). J. E. Kuhn (1806-1887) was the author of a four-volume *Katholische Dogmatik* (1846-1868) and *Das Leben Jesu* (1838), a reply to Strauss' famous life of Christ. K. J. Hefele (1809-1893), church historian, professor and Bishop of Rottenburg, authored the monumental seven-volume *Concilien-geschichte* (1855-1874) which brought the provincial and ecumenical councils up to the mid-fifteenth century and, in doing so, he supplied the milieu and historical setting of the councils.

167. Vatican Council I, twentieth of the general councils of the Roman Catholic Church and held in St. Peter's Basilica from 1869 to 1870, promulgated two doctrinal constitutions: *Dei Filius*, which dealt with faith, reason, and their interrelation, and *Pastor aeternus*, which defined the jurisdictional primacy and infallibility of the pope.

168. One should compare this to Prince S. N. Trubetskoi's subsequent extension of Khomiakov's criticism of the entire history of modern philosophy as being founded on the "principle of personal conviction," to which he counterposed the doctrine of catholic or conciliar consciousness [Author's note].

169. William Palmer (1811-1879) was an Anglican professor at Oxford who developed a great interest in the Russian Church. He was particularly occupied with promoting intercommunion between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, and made journeys to Russia in 1840 and 1842. During his stays in Russia, which he describes in *Notes on a Visit to the Russian Church* (first published in 1882), Palmer met with many influential figures in the Russian Church. His correspondence with Khomiakov is published in J. Birkbeck, ed., *Russia and the English Church During the Last Fifty Years* (London, 1895).

170. *Stefan Iavorskii i Feofan Prokopovich*, volume 5 in Samarin's *Sochineniia* (Moscow, 1880).

171. Aleksandr N. Popov (1820-1877), a historian of Russia, was in the 1840s close to Iurii Samarin, with whom he quarreled on the question of the development of religion.

172. The circular letter was written by Patriarch Photius of Constantinople (c. 820-891) to the eastern patriarchs. It has been reproduced in Russian on earlier occasions than 1848, and was appended to the second edition of *Razgovory mezhdu ispytuiushchim i uverennym o*

pravoslavii vostochnoi greko-rossiiskoi tserkvi, s prisovokupleniem vypiski iz okruzhnago pis'ma Fotiia, patriarkha tsargradskago, k vostochnym patriarshim prestolam (Moscow, 1833), written by Filaret of Moscow in 1811. See above, vol. I, p. 213. See Professor Richard Haugh's translations of Patriarch Photius' letter and his *Mystagogia*. They appeared ready for publication in 1976. [Author's note].

173. Eunomius of Constantinople (c. 335 - c. 394) was bishop of Cyzicus and defender of Anomoeanism, the radical wing of Arianism. What little is known of his writings stems from the preserved refutations by Basil the Great of Cappadocia, Gregory of Nyssa, and Apollinarius. See volume seven, *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*, in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky* for separate chapters on St. Basil and on St. Gregory of Nyssa. A critique of the thought of Apollinarius and the Apollinarians is contained in volume seven, and at greater length in volume eight, *The Byzantine Fathers of the Fifth Century* in the *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*.

174. Not even A. V. Gorskii, in his unconvincing and unpenetrating essays on Khomiakov, constitutes an exception. See his "Zamechaniia" on Khomiakov in *Bogoslovskii Vestnik* (November, 1900). [Author's note]. Gorskii (d. 1875) served for many years as rector of the Moscow Academy. See below.

175. The Crimean War, which began in 1853 and ended in 1856, was a major defeat for Russia and had wide repercussions in Russian society. Russia had provoked the conflict, hoping that it would prove the death blow for the Ottoman Empire. England and France, however, felt it necessary to prevent Russian expansion by not allowing the Turkish state to fall apart, and declared war on Russia. In the war the Russian forces were humiliated by the English and the French as it became apparent to all that Russia was years behind Western Europe in military technology and capabilities. Thus, the country that emerged from the Napoleonic wars as the dominant military power in Europe suffered a loss in prestige that it would not recover until 1945. To a great many in Russian society this was a sign that the autocratic system of Alexander and Nicholas I could not survive.

176. Tsar Nicholas I died in 1855, before the end of the Crimean War, and it fell to his son and successor Alexander II to make peace and attempt to heal the Russian nation. The new tsar immediately turned his efforts to wide-ranging reforms of the Russian social, political, legal and military systems, beginning with official consultations leading to the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. The reforms, however, came too late and were not sufficient to really solve Russia's problems and stem the growing tide of radical activity. In 1881 Alexander was assassinated, and the new tsar, Alexander III, responded by abandoning the idea of fundamental reform and regressing to the autocratic ideal that had proved so barren earlier in the century.

177. N. N. Strakhov (1828-1869) was a writer and literary critic, and along with Apollon Grigor'ev and Dostoevskii formed the core of the editorial staff of *Vremia*. Strakhov belonged to the circle of "men of the soil" [*pochvenniki*], who called for a return to the Russian soil and

Orthodoxy. For a recent treatment of him, see Linda Gerstein, *Nikolai Strakhov* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971).

178. N. V. Shelgunov (1824-1891) was a writer associated with the journal *The Contemporary*. He participated in establishing clandestine groups for distributing manifestoes and making contact between students and peasants.

179. The author of an autobiography that provides a valuable portrayal of this time, Nikita Petrovich Giliarov-Platonov (1824-1887) graduated from the Moscow Academy, taught there, and worked for the government before devoting his full energies to journalism. He published a daily newspaper in Moscow with Slavophile leanings, and contributed to other Slavophile publications.

180. V. V. Stasov (1824-1904) was a Russian artist and musical critic.

181. The reference is to Leont'ev's "Strannitsy vospominanii," *Sochineniia* (1904), vol. 3. On Leont'ev, see below and note 241.

182. D. I. Pisarev (1840-1868) was one of the leading nihilists of the 1860s. He made repeated calls for the destruction of esthetics and popularized Darwin, Buckle, and Comte among the Russian youth of his time. Varfolomei Zaitsev (1841-1882), the "Russian Rochefort," was a journalist who began his career writing for *Russian Word* [*Russkoe slovo*]. As a political exile from Russia, he later participated in the founding of the First International.

183. Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788) and *Critique of Judgment* (1790) came out at the end of the 1780s. His *Critique of Pure Reason* had been published in 1781.

184. Irinarkh Vvedenskii (1815-1855) was in the nineteenth century often considered the "founder of nihilism." He organized a circle in St. Petersburg in order to discuss socio-political and occasionally philosophical subjects. The Russian social critic Nikolai Chernyshevskii belonged to the Vvedenskii circle during his student days.

185. The various crosscurrents in Russian nihilism are recently traced in Daniel R. Brower, *Training the Nihilists. Education and Radicalism in Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975).

186. See note 182 in this section. Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) was an English Utilitarian and leader of the Philosophical Radicals. James Mill (1773-1836), Scottish philosopher, historian and economist, raised his son, John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), in the Benthamite spirit of philosophical radicalism. John Mill, the leading nineteenth-century English philosopher, is generally considered to be the most effective spokesman for the liberal view of man and society.

187. Afanasii A. Fet (1820-1892) was a leading nineteenth-century Russian poet. Fedor Tiutchev (1803-1873) was a deeply lyrical poet of love and nature. Of his approximately three hundred poems, probably *Silentium* (1833) is best known to western readers.

188. Valentin Aleksandrovich Serov (1865-1911) was an outstanding artist and portrait painter. He is especially well-known for his portraits of the imperial family of Tsar Alexander III. Petr Ilich Chaikovskii (1840-1893), famous composer of symphonies (six of them) and ballets, is best-known for *Swan Lake* (1876) and *Nutcracker* (1892). Alexander P. Borodin (1833-1887) was a composer and scientist and one of the famous "Five" composers, together with Musorgskii, Cui, Rimskii-Korsakov (1844-1908), whose influence on instrumentation and program music was great both in Russia and abroad.

189. On Solov'ev, see below, this chapter, section eleven; on Leont'ev, see below this chapter, section ten; on Apollon Grigor'ev, see above, this chapter, note 2; on Fedorov, see below, this chapter, section twelve.

190. The *raznochintsy* were often sons of the clergy, minor officials, or quasi-professionals who took leading roles in the intelligentsia. See C. Becker, "*Raznochintsy*: The Development of the Word and the Concept," *American Slavic and East European Review*, 18 (1959), pp. 63-74.

191. George Henry Lewes (1817-1878), the husband of the novelist George Eliot, was an English journalist, scientist and philosopher. His *Biographical History of Philosophy*, 4 vols. (London, 1845-1846) aimed to replace metaphysics with "scientific positivism."

192. Nikolai Mikhailovskii (1842-1904) was one of the leaders of the populist movement in the 1870s. For a recent study on him, see James Billington, *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism* (Oxford, 1958).

193. The term "thick journals" refers to the new monthly periodical press which discussed the leading social, literary, artistic, and, to some extent, political issues of the day.

194. The reference is to Simon L. Frank's "Etika nigilizma," in *Vekhi* (1909) and reprinted in *Filosofiia i zhizn'* (1910). Simon Frank (1877-1950) was a philosopher who taught at Moscow University before being exiled by the Soviet government in 1922. He eventually settled in London.

195. *The Contemporary* [*Sovremennik*] became, under the general editorship of N. A. Nekrasov, the main forum for the writings of the "going to the people" movement in the 1860s. On P. D. Iurkevich (1827-1874) see above, note 41. Petr Lavrov (1823-1900), a member of the gentry, was one of the most prominent representatives of revolutionary populism. A recent study on him is by Philip Pomper, Peter *Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement* (Chicago, 1972).

196. Viktor Ipat'evich Askochenskii (1820-1879), a graduate of the Academy of Kiev and later a professor of patrology there, was the founder and editor of the journal *Domashniaia beseda*. He wrote critically on the contemporary state of church affairs and carried on a heated polemic with Feodor Bukharev, which is discussed in the following chapter, section 3. Nikolai G. Chernyshevskii (1828-1889), a son of a priest, was a Russian radical leader and literary critic. His religious experience is dealt with in the next section of this chapter.

197. A well-known German atheist philosopher, Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872) maintained that God is a subjective principle created by the human consciousness and that all religion is a psychological illusion. His most famous work is *Das Wesen des Christentums* [*The Essence of Christianity*, Leipzig, 1841]. For one of the most incisive critiques of Feuerbach's thought, see Sergei Bulgakov, *Karl Marx as A Religious Type: His Relation to the Religion of Anthropotheism of L. Feuerbach*, esp. pp. 79-90 and 99-105.

198. Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) was a German philosopher who opposed the teachings of Hegel and considered himself the true successor of Kant. In his view, each individual has the will to live, and intellect and consciousness arise as instruments in the service of the will. The conflict between individual wills is then the source of pain and creates a world of unsatisfied wants and pain. Schopenhauer's moral and ethical teaching was based on sympathy, with the moral will, feeling another's hurt as its own, making an effort to relieve the pain. Karolina Pavlova (b. Ianish, 1807-1893) was a Russian poet of a Slavophile orientation. Her *Double Life* [*Dvoinaia zhizn'*, 1848] was translated into several languages. A. F. Pisemskii (1820-1881), a writer and playwright, contributed to Pogodin's journal *The Muscovite* in the 1850's and had a skeptical, if not cynical, attitude to reform. His most important work, *A Thousand Souls* [*Tysiacha dush*], was published in 1858.

199. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865), a French "libertarian socialist" philosopher, had the reputation of being a radical and anarchist. His first published work, *What is Property?* (1840), contains the famous dictum "property is theft." Proudhon's other major works include *The General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century* (1851) and *On Justice in Revolution and in the Church* (1858).

200. Ludwig Büchner (1824-1899) was a German philosopher and proponent of a scientific worldview. His *Force and Matter* was a best seller in several languages. Büchner is often remembered for his famous aphorism: "Philosophers are wonderful people. The less they understand of a thing, the more they make over it." Jacob Moleschott (1822-1893) was a physiologist and philosopher, and the author of what became a handbook of the materialist movement, *The Circuit of Life* . Karl Vogt (1817-1895) was a member and continuator of the Moleschott-Büchner school.

201. "Iskander," the Turkish form of Alexander, was a pen name of Aleksandr Herzen. The *Pis'ma ob izuchenii prirody* were written between 1844 and 1846.

202. Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) was a famous German theologian who recommended Christianity from a neo-Kantian and historical standpoint. His major work has been translated into English: *Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh and New York, 1872-1900). Rudolf Hermann Lotze (1817-1881), a German philosopher and psychologist, sought to reconcile the views of mechanistic science with romantic idealism. His major works include *Mikrokosmus* (1856-1864); *Logik* (1874); and *Metaphysik* (1879).

203. Nikolai Treskin, a student at St. Petersburg University along with Pisarev, was one of Pisarev's few male friends. He seems to have been an

organizer of a group, which looked down upon Dobroliubov and *The Contemporary* [*Sovremennik*] and, according to Pisarev, called themselves by contrast "men of thought." *Sobranie sochinenii*, 4 vols., (Moscow, 1955-1956); vol. 2, p. 179.

204. It was not published. [Author's note]. *Der Messias* was a composition of the German poet Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724-1803).

205. Like Chernyshevskii, who was a well-educated son of a priest, Nikolai Dobroliubov (1836-1861) also contributed to the journal *The Contemporary* and was a leader of the radical movement until his sudden death at the age of twenty-five.

206. V. V. Lesevich (1837-1906) was a Russian philosopher and one of the founders of the journal *Russian Wealth* [*Russkoe bogatstvo*], which had a strong populist bent.

207. Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck (1744-1829) was a French biologist and formulator of the first comprehensive theory of evolution. From his study of fossils he concluded that animal life had existed for a large part of geologic time and had also undergone gradual changes. Hence, species must be mutable. Lamarck believed man to be the being who best exemplifies the highest excellence of bodily organization found in nature, an idea he united with the eighteenth-century deist view of an infinitely graded series of forms from lowest to highest. He argued that characteristics acquired by an animal through environmental changes were preserved by heredity. In this scheme, man's "extreme superiority" over other living things was stressed.

208. Petr Kropotkin (1842-1921) was one of the chief Russian theoreticians of anarchism, and also a noted geographer and traveler. Nikolai Ia. Danilevskii (1822-1885) was a strong opponent of Darwinism, and developed his own theory of nations as unique cultural types. His basic work, *Russia and Europe*, was written in 1865, but only became popular in an 1888 edition, and thereafter had wide influence and provoked great controversy among Russian intellectuals.

209. George P. Fedotov (1886-1951) was a professor of history in Russia both before and after the revolution, and after his emigration in 1925 he became one of the most respected intellectual figures in the Russian emigration, teaching church history at the Russian Theological School in Paris and later at St. Vladimir's Seminary in New York. His *Collected Works* are being published.

210. Note his tale about a stay at the hospital of Prince Dondukov-Korsakov in the village of Burigy. [Author's note]. O. V. Aptekman (1849-1926) was a prominent populist leader. He helped to organize the revolutionary party Land and Liberty, and later adhered to a group called the Black Partition. After exile he went to Germany to study medicine, and for a time became a Menshevik. Prince Aleksandr Mikhailovich Dondukov-Korsakov was an important figure in the imperial government. He reorganized the civil administration of Bulgaria when he was appointed imperial commissar following the Russo-Turkish War in 1877, and was also the chairman of the committee that was established in 1883 to integrate the Caucasus into the Russian imperial administration.

211. Shatov is a central figure in Dostoevskii's *The Devils.*

212. V. V. Bervi (pseudonym N. Flerovskii, 1829-1918) was a Russian economist and sociologist. He studied law at Kazan University in the 1840s and in the 1860s joined the populist movement.

213. V. B. Bogucharskii (pseudonym of V. Ia. Iakovlev, 1861-1915) was an historian of the populist movement.

214. Note in particular the stay of A. Mikhailov among the *Spasovtsy* below Saratov. [Author's note]. A. D. Mikhailov (1855-1884) was a populist who settled in 1873 among the Old Believer sect the *Spasovtsy.* The next year he returned to St. Petersburg to assist in reorganizing the Land and Liberty Party. Early in the Schism there arose the conviction that without the sacraments there could be no liturgy – grace had "flown" to heaven. Those who took this view were termed *netovtsy*, or the "deniers." Among them, however, was posed a further question: is salvation possible without the sacraments and the liturgy? The affirmative answer to this question rested on the view that only Christ the Savior knows, and it is necessary to pray to him and beg for mercy. Those who took this "salvation" [*spasenie*] view were known as "*spasovy*" or "*spasovtsy.*"

215. A. K. Makilov (d. 1904) was a native of Orel, and there founded his "deohumanist" program. A member of the party People's Will, he emigrated to America in 1874 to live in a communist colony established by Frey.

216. The "*Chaikovtsy*" were members of a student circle headed by N. V. Chaikovskii at the St. Petersburg Medical Academy. The group included Kropotkin and Bervi-Flerovskii and was broken up in 1873.

217. Pierre Leroux (1797-1871) was a French socialist who followed Saint-Simon and believed that the French Revolution had proclaimed fraternity but did not achieve it, and therefore what was most needed was a religion of humanity.

218. See, for example, Stepniak Kravchenskii in his *Underground Russia* [*Podpol'naia Rossiia*]. [Author's note]. Sergei M. (pseudonym Stepniak) Kravchenskii (1851-1895) was a Russian publicist and prominent leader of the populist movement in the 1870s. He began his career as a revolutionary among the *Chaikovsty.*

219. See my article "Religioznyia temy Dostoevskago," *Rossiia i Slavianstvo* 117 (February 21, 1931). Many valuable observations are also to be found in the book by M. M. Bakhtin, *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskago* (1929). The idea (on pp. 41-42) about Dostoevskii's world was profoundly pluralistic. If one is to seek the image for him to which, so to speak, this entire world gravitates, then it appears as the Church, as a community of undiffused souls." This can be compared to Dante. [Author's note].

220. Raskolnikov is the main character in Dostoevskii's *Crime and Punishment*. He is obsessed with a theory of morality that uses the person of Napoleon as its most consistent example.

221. Charles François-Marie Fourier (1772-1837) was a French social theorist who advocated a reconstruction of society based on communist associations of producers, known as "phalansteries." Some of his important works are *Théorie des quatre mouvements et des destinées générales* (1808); *Traité de l'association agricole domestique* (1822); and *Le nouveau monde industriel* (1829-1830).

222. George Sand was the pseudonym of Amantine Lucile Aurore Dupin (1804-1876), a French writer known for her emotional novels. Mme. Sand's themes ranged from passions and the suffering of women to socialism and humanism and a return to nature. She had a significant influence on a number of Russian writers, beginning with Pushkin.

223. Vasilii Leonidovich Komarovich (b. 1894). *Dostoevskii. Sovremennye problemy istoriko-literaturnogo izucheniia* (Leningrad: Obrazovanie, 1925).

224. This is the title of Chernyshevskii's famous novel, which was written while the author was imprisoned in the Peter and Paul fortress and served as a political tract for revolutionaries.

225. In January, 1861, Dostoevsky, his brother Mikhail, the critic Grigor'ev, and the philosopher N. N. Strakhov began to publish the journal, *Time* [*Vremia*]. The aim was to reconcile Westerners and Slavophiles according to views which became known as *pochvennichestvo* (from the Russian *pochva*, meaning soil).

226. The original text of Dostoevskii's "Testament" ["Pokazaniia"] of 1849 (published in *Kosmopolis*, September 1898, pp. 193-212) very sharply poses the theme of isolation: "We ourselves flee from community, we divide into small circles, or grow hardened in isolation" (p. 198). [Author's note].

227. The starets Zosima is a central character in Dostoevskii's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Makar Ivanovich is Father Makarii (Mikhail Ivanov), a member of the gentry who was tonsured in 1815 and from 1834 lived at the Optina hermitage. As the superior of the skete he was renowned for his strict life and spiritual teachings.

228. The "Pushkin Speech," Dostoevskii's most celebrated public address, was delivered at the unveiling of a monument to Pushkin in Moscow in 1880.

229. Pierre Jean de Béranger (1780-1857) was a French poet whose works reflected a temperament guided by a strong sense of human charity and brotherly love.

230. See N. Berdiaev, *Constantine Leontieff* (the undated French translation by H. Iswolsky). [Author's note].

231. One should also note the *Conversations Useful to the Soul* [*Dushepoleznyia besedy*] of the monastic elder Zosima Verkhovskoi, who lived an ascetic life near the city of Kuznetsk in Siberia. [Author's note]. On St. Tikhon's influence on Dostoevskii, see Nadejda Gorodetzky, *Saint Tikhon of Zadonsk: Inspirer of Dostoevsky* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976).

232. Leon Marie Bloy (1846-1917) was a French novelist and religious essayist.

233. Solov'ev's *The History and Future of Theocracy* [*Istoriia i budushchnost' teokratii*], which the author referred to as his "theocratic Leviathan," was written between 1884 and 1886.

234. Eduard von Hartmann (1842-1906) was a German pessimistic philosopher. His philosophy is set forth in his *Die Philosophie des Unbewußten* (Berlin, 1869; 9th ed. trans. by W. C. Coupland as *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, London, 1884, 3 vols.). Pessimism derives from the fact that happiness cannot be attained in the present life, in the transcendent life after death, or in a future state of this world.

235. Petr Grigor'evich Redkin (1808-1891) became an adherent of Hegel's views while a student at the University of Berlin. He returned to Russia in 1835 to become a well-known jurist and a highly popular professor at Moscow University. Dmitrii L'vovich Kriukov (1809-1845) also studied at Berlin and became known as a philologist and classicist. He was a specialist in the economic foundations of classical culture and taught Latin literature and antiquities at Moscow University from 1835.

236. Aleksandr Fedorovich Labzin (1766-1825) was a minor government official under emperors Paul and Alexander I and one of the most prominent leaders of Russian freemasonry at that time. He opened his own Rosicrucian lodge in 1800, occupied himself with the translation and publication of the works of the western mystics Eckartshausen and Jung-Stilling, founded the popular journal *Messenger of Zion*, and was an active member of the Russian Bible Society.

237. Note his "Hymns" -- "Words of great joy," as Aleksandr Blok expressed it. [Author's note].

238. Hieromonk Parfenii (c. 1807-1878) appealed to Grigor'ev as a writer from the people, a man who spoke and wrote with child-like simplicity, yet with great artistry. Parfenii related his various adventures in Greece and the Near East in *Skazanie o strantsvii i puteshestvii po rossii, moldavii, turtsii i sviatoi zemle* , 4 vols. (Moscow, 1856). See Apollon Grigor'ev's *Vospominaniia* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1930), p. 216.

239. *O pravoslavii v otnoshenii k sovremennosti* [*On Orthodoxy in Relation to Contemporary Times*, first published in St. Petersburg, 1861]. Feodor Bukharev (1824-1871) had studied at Moscow Academy and lectured on Holy Scripture there. He first became known for letters written to the writer Gogol, which were published in 1861 but written in 1848. These, as well as his book on Orthodoxy, were controversial and won their author a transfer to the Kazan Academy in 1854. The next year he moved to St. Petersburg to serve on the ecclesiastical censorship

committee. Here he became embroiled in a violent controversy over Askochenskii's new journal, *Domashniaia beseda* , and eventually became disillusioned and abandoned his monastic vows. See chapter VII, section 3.

240. *The Muscovite* [*Moskvitianin*], published between 1841 and 1846 by Mikhail Pogodin, combined elements of "official nationality" and Slavophilism. In the 1850s the languishing journal was revived under a new "young editorial board," in which Grigor'ev played a leading role.

241. In the 1890s Leont'ev and Tertii Filippov were close, drawn to each other by a common ecclesiastical-political Graecophilism. At that time Leont'ev was hoping for a future strengthening of the authority of the ecumenical patriarch (after the incorporation of Constantinople into Russia), which was necessary in order to "centralize the ecclesiastical administration of Orthodoxy." Leont'ev underscored the Church's independence, "power and freedom." [Author's note]. Tertii Filippov (1825-1899) was a state and social activist and publicist. He championed the idea of returning Russia to the "days of Kotoshikin," as he found the church structure of pre-Petrine Russia, with the patriarchate and councils, more suited to the national peculiarities of the Russian people. Filippov also worked to popularize Russian folksongs.

242. Leont'ev later wrote a short book on Father Kliment entitled *Otets Kliment Zedergol'm: Ieromonakh optinoi pustyni* (Moscow, 1882; reprinted in Leont'ev's *Sochinenie*, Paris: YMCA Press, 1978).

243. As Rudolf Haym makes clear in his famous book *Die romantische Schule* (Berlin, 1914) about the differences between romanticism and Hegelianism. [Author's note].

244. L. M. Lopatin was the editor of the journal *Problems of Philosophy and Psychology* [*Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*] and, after the death of N. Ia. Grot, the head of the Moscow Psychological Society. His book *The Philosophy of Vladimir Soloviev* was translated into English by A. Bashky and published by the University of Aberdeen Press in 1916.

245. N. I. Kareev edited the historical journal *Istoricheskoe obozrenie* and the historical sections of the Brockhaus-Ephron Encyclopedia. On Solovi'ev's youth, see Fr. Florovskii's article "Molodye gody VI. Solov'eva," *Put'*, no. 9 (1928), also in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*.

246. This was written in 1873. [Author's note].

247. Note the references to returning to and drawing near to the people in his speeches of March 1881. [Author's note].

248. The Perfectionist colony at Oneida, New York, together with that at Putney, Vermont, was founded by John Humphrey Noyes in the expectation of the second coming of Christ.

249. See. I. I. Ianzhul, "Vospominaniia," in *Russkaia starina* of March 1910. It was also published as an offset in 1914. [Author's note]. The title of Nordhof's book is *The Communistic Societies of the United*

States: from personal visit and observation: including detailed accounts of the Economists, Zoarites, Shakers and other existing societies (London, 1875).

250. The printed text of the *Lectures* does not fully correspond to their original presentation in 1878. The publication was delayed until 1882. *Tserkovnyi vestnik* issued a preliminary stenographic report, but it was quietly halted. See the letter of N. N. Strakhov to Lev Tolstoi about Solov'ev's final lecture in April 1878 (which, by the way, Malikov attended). "This lecture was very effective. With great heat he spoke several words against the dogma of eternal torments. Of course, he was prepared to preach many other heresies, but obviously did not dare, and chose this dogma for the purpose of expressing himself with complete clarity." Strakhov concludes: "A pantheism emerges quite resembling a Hegelian one, only with the second coming along with it. The Kabbala, gnosticism, and mysticism are introduced here in good measure." *Tolstovskii muzei*, 160-161. [Author's note].

251. This report of a contemporary was taken from an essay by N. Minskii, "Novoe slovo Solov'eva," *Ustoi*, no. 2 (1881), as cited in Koz'min, *Ot 19 fevralia k 1 martu: Ocherki po istorii narodnichestva* (Moscow, 1933), pp. 276-277. [Author's note].

252. Note the curious observations of P. L. Lavrov, *Sotsial'naia revoliutsiia i zadachi nravstvennosti: Starye voprosy* (1881), and the notes of P. Vitiazev, Kolos (Prague, 1921), pp. 98-99: "In the mid-1870s the strange news came to London's emigrant monastery of a mystical sect among the Russian revolutionaries. The news proved accurate. Highly respected people had been seized by the epidemic. But it did not last long." Characteristically, Lavrov found it awkward to question the participants in the movement, and therefore he had only a very confused knowledge of it. "With its appearance in Russia at the outset of the 1880s, experience in the religious element began to be repeated more often and received a more precise form. . . . Everywhere this largely fantastic mix of Orthodoxy and philosophical idealism, pop - ulism and the artful devices of idealism, which are accessible only to a small minority, struck everyone. . . . Sadder still, the tender youths educated in an age recently past on the sober thoughts of Belinskii, Herzen, Chernyshevskii, and Dobroliubov are becoming accustomed to crowding around the lecterns of enraptured preachers who obscure the contradiction between science and religion; they are becoming habituated to considering treatises which, for all the talent of their authors, formerly would not have even been cracked open." Lavrov, above all, had in mind Solov'ev (and also Lev Tolstoi). Solov'ev had at the time given a lecture on the course of Russia's enlightenment up to that present time. [Author's note].

253. Note Schopenhauer's influence on Turgenev and, particularly, on Fet. [Author's note].

254. See the very valuable article by Volzhskii, "Problema zla u Vl. Solov'eva," *Voprosy religii*, pt. 1 (1906), pp. 221-297; "Chelovek v filosofskoi sisteme V. S. Solov'eva," *Russskie vedomosti*, No. 209 (1903); and in the collection *Iz mira literaturnykh iskanii* (1906). [Author's note].

255. Transformationism is the hypothesis that organic evolution proceeds by the transformation of one species into another. The hypothesis began with Lamarck, who argued that evolution occurs through adaptation. Darwin maintained that evolution came about through natural selection. "Popular" transformationism usually denotes only Darwin's variant.

256. Note already the law of universal gravity, which forms the natural solidarity of the world. [Author's note].

257. On Böhme, see vol. I, p. 323, note 105 and vol. II, chapter six, note 24. Philippus Aureolus Paracelsus, alias for Philippus Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (c. 1493-1541), was a German physician and theologian. He was interested in philosophy, astronomy, alchemy, and virtue, which he considered the four pillars of healing. In theology he was most influenced by Duns Scotus. His contributions to medicine and chemistry emerged from his experience with alchemical and gnostic ideas.

258. Only *The Justification of the Good* [*Opravdanie dobra*] and an essay on "theoretical philosophy" relate to his later years. [Author's note]. The essay is *Osnovy teoreticheskoi filosofii* (1897-1899), part I of which is translated by Vlada Tolley and James P. Scanlan as "Foundations of Theoretical Philosophy" and included in James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan, Mary-Barbara Zeldin, and George L. Kline, eds. *Russian Philosophy*, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1965), 3: 99-134.

259. Giovanni Domenico Mansi (1692-1769) was a Catholic theologian, editor, and publisher of the famous collection of the acts of the Roman Catholic Councils to 1440. The work, entitled *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissa collecto*, was published in thirty-one volumes in Florence and Venice between 1759 and 1798.

260. Jacques Paul Migne (1800-1875), the famous patrologist and publisher, is well-known for his publications of the Latin and Greek fathers. The *Series Latina* (221 vols., 1844-1864) covered the Latin authors from Tertullian to Innocent III. The *Series Graeca* (161 vols., 1857-1866) comprises the Greek and Latin texts of authors from the pseudo-Barnabas up to the Council of Florence (1438) and 81 more volumes (1856-1867) of the Latin text only of the Greek fathers.

261. On St. Teresa, see above, vol. I, p. 348, note 16.

262. Note Solov'ev's doctrine of the "universal or absolute man" or "pan-human organism," as well as the "eternal body of God." [Author's note].

263. This is a reference to the assassination of Alexander II, which occurred on March 1/13, 1881. Solov'ev, in a public lecture, condemned the revolutionaries but called for mercy. As a result, he was forced to retire from teaching and from making public statements.

264. See the essay *Spiritual Authority in Russia* [*Dukhovnaia vlast' v Rossii*, 1880]. [Author's note].

265. Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer (1815-1905) enthusiastically promoted the unification of the churches. At Vatican Council I he was a leading opponent of a definition of papal infallibility, partly because he wanted to gain the conversion of Russia. To this end he worked with Solov'ev. See also above, this chapter, note 53 and below, note 268.

266. In "Tiutchev i Solov'ev," *Put'*, no. 41 (1933), Florovsky shows that Tiutchev influenced Solov'ev's views on Catholicism. See the volume on theology and literature in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*.

267. Leont'ev relates Solov'ev's hypothesis for the still-unprinted section of *Critique of Abstract Principles*: "After the reconciliation of the churches, under the influence of the seven sacraments the whole world will be reborn not only morally, but also physically and esthetically." [Author's note].

268. Several curious details can be found in the correspondence of Fr. Racki and Bishop Strossmayer, published as *Korespondencija Racki-Strossmayer*, 4 vols. (Zagreb, 1928-1931). Racki followed the "Great Debate" attentively. He had become acquainted with Solov'ev in Moscow in September of 1884, when Solov'ev was writing about the Roman primate. Solov'ev first went to Zagreb and Diakovar in July of 1886. Racki advised him to write in French rather than German. Solov'ev's French book grew from the essay he began to write in 1886 for Leroy-Beaulieu under the title *Philosophie de l'église universelle*. Bishop Strossmayer regretfully noted that in Rome there was little interest in Solov'ev's ideas (3: 223; 3: 200). Nonetheless, he advised Solov'ev to travel to Rome and counted on the pope receiving him personally. However, national-diplomatic difficulties (in particular the Austrian-Slavic tension and the Russo-Polish question) proved insurmountable. Later, theological differences were added. [Author's note]. The "Great Debate" referred to above is a reference to several articles Solov'ev published in 1883 under the title "The Great Debate and Christian Policy," defending the primacy of Rome.

269. See Florovsky"s essay "Proekt mnimago dela," *Sovremenniia zapiski* 39 (1935). Also in *The Collected Works*.

270. I. I. Mechnikov (1845-1916) was a famous biologist and pathologist who, in the name of a "scientific worldview," wrote on ethics as well. His reflections, published in Paris as *Études sur la nature humaine* (1903) and *Essais optimistes* (1907), contain the idea that man, through science, can remedy his imperfect nature. His wife, O. N. Mechnikova, wrote his biography, published in English as *The Life of Metchnikoff* (London, 1921).

271. Pelagianism, the heresy which holds that man can take the initial and fundamental steps toward salvation by his own efforts, apart from Divine Grace, became a raging theological controversy in Latin Christianity in the fourth century and was vigorously opposed by St. Augustine. For a detailed analysis of the problem, especially in relationship to Eastern Christianity, see Richard Haugh, *Augustine and Eastern Christianity* and *St. Augustine and St. John Cassian*.

272. On Comte, see above, this chapter, note 96.

273. Comte's "positivist" ideas were not confined to philosophy. He increasingly in later life turned from philosophical and scientific interests to a form of mysticism, which he called the new religion of humanity. It had its holy days and catechism, and was non-theistic.

274. Charles Fourier (1772-1837) was a French social critic, socialist and eccentric. He believed that the world was one, and therefore the coming "harmony" would lead to new, beneficial creations on earth and result in the appearance of new satellites, the recovery of health by our planet, and other favorable repercussions. Denis Diderot (1713-1784), the French encyclopedist, philosopher, critic, and satirist, believed in the constant change of things in the universe and the spontaneous generation of new forms. Restif de la Bretonne [Nicholas Edme] (1734-1806) shared the obsession of many during the troubled years of the late eighteenth century that the planets would return to the Sun, and the latter to the "Sun of Suns," which would periodically absorb them and then put forth new ones. Unity thus alternated with diversity.

275. Boris Nikolaevich Chicherin (1828-1904) was a philosopher, historian, leading Russian liberal, and a representative of Russian Hegelianism. Konstantin D. Kavelin (1818-1885) was a Russian liberal, a historian and a philosopher. Pavel Bakunin (1820-1900), brother of the famous anarchist, Michael Bakunin, was a follower of Hegel. For a time he participated in the work of the *zemstva*, the institutions of local self-government granted by Alexander II as part of the Great Reforms. Nikolai N. Strakhov (1828-1896), a literary critic of considerable talent, was an adherent to the idea of *pochvennichestvo* discussed above, note 225. Nikolai G. Debol'skii (1842-1918) was another representative of Hegelianism in Russia, although later in his life his enthusiasm for Hegel diminished. Aleksei A. Kozlov (1831-1900) was a philosopher of personalism, who wrote in the spirit of Leibniz on the subject. Lev M. Lopatin (1855-1920) was a close friend of Vladimir Solov'ev since childhood and a philosopher. For many year he served as president of the Moscow Psychological Society. Princes Sergei N. (1862-1905) and Evgenii N. (1863-1920) Trubetskoi were two gifted religious-philosophical thinkers who came to be associated with the Russian religious renaissance of the early twentieth century.

276. Nikolai Iakovlevich Grot (1852-1899) was a professor of philosophy at Moscow University and founder of the journal *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*, the first purely philosophical journal in Russia.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. A. N. Murav'ev (1806-1874) was a well-known writer in the mid-nineteenth century. He worked as an assistant to the Over-Procurators Nechaev and Protasov and was the author of a history of the Russian Church which was translated into English by R. W. Blackmore (London, 1842). Mikhail Pogodin (1800-1875), a historian with a conservative cast of mind, taught at Moscow University, worked on several journals, and also served in the Ministry of Education. His chief work is a seven-volume history of Russia (Moscow, 1846-1857). Mikhail Katkov (1818-1887) was one of the leading conservative journalists of this time. In the

1850s he was actually a liberal and supported the Great Reforms but by the mid-1860s, as editor of the influential journals *Russian Messenger* and *Moscow*, he was a staunch supporter of autocracy. Katkov had particular influence in Count Dmitrii Tolstoi's Ministry of Education.

2. The report was published only much later. [Author's note].

3. See below.

4. Innokentii succeeded Filaret at Moscow. His appointment was ascribed to Murav'ev's promptings. His correspondence with Murav'ev is quite interesting. [Author's note]. Innokentii (Innocent) was canonized on October 6, 1977 by the Russian Orthodox Church in recognition of his outstanding missionary labors in Alaska and the Far East. Born Ivan Popov in 1797 to a clerical family in Irkutsk, he studied at the Irkutsk Seminary, where he acquired the name Veniaminov and was ordained priest after completing studies in 1821. Shortly thereafter, the Holy Synod issued a call for a volunteer to go to Alaska and care for the spiritual needs of both the Russians and the natives in the areas where the Russian-American Trading Company was operating. These areas, encompassing the Aleutian Islands and the Alaskan panhandle, had been evangelized at the end of the eighteenth century by a group of monks from the Valaamo Monastery, including St. Herman of Alaska, but by this time the mission had fallen into neglect. Fr. Veniaminov took up the call and in 1823 set off with his family to Alaska. He served first in Sitka, but in 1824 he was transferred to Unalaska where he remained for ten years, building churches, translating the *Catechism* and the *Gospel of Matthew* into Aleut, and traveling extensively to build up the faith among the natives on the scattered islands. In 1834 Fr. Veniaminov moved back to Sitka, continuing his missionary labors among the Tlingit Indians until 1838, when he set out for central Russia to seek support for the American Mission in Moscow and St. Petersburg. While in Moscow, where he became close to Metropolitan Filaret, Fr. Veniaminov received the news that his wife – who had returned from Sitka to Irkutsk – had died and, after seeing his children were provided for and after much persuasion from Filaret, Fr. Veniaminov followed the customary practice for widowed priests and took monastic vows. Three days later, a decision was made to create a Diocese of Kamchatka, and the new monk Innokentii was immediately appointed its first bishop. In 1841 Bishop Innokentii resumed his work in North America, making Sitka his episcopal residence and founding a seminary there. After another eleven years he transferred his diocesan seat to Iakutsk in Siberia and continued his labors among the natives of that region, producing a *Gospel of Matthew* in Iakut. Named a member of the Holy Synod in 1865, Innokentii worked diligently in his new capacity and was a persistent force in the Synod in support of new seminary statutes, monastic revival, better material backing for the clergy, and, of course, mission work, himself guiding the creation of the Orthodox Missionary Society. Innokentii died on Holy Saturday in 1879.

5. After the Petrine reforms of 1721, the Over Procurator was the lay representative to the Holy Synod. A century later, the Over Procurator had become the sole intermediary between the Synod and the emperor, and the office of the Over Procurator had achieved cabinet status. Protasov, who was Nicholas I's Over Procurator from 1836-1855, constructed a

centralized, bureaucratic, lay-dominated administration of the Russian Orthodox Church. The independence of the upper clergy in the Synod and in the diocese was continually reduced by Protasov to achieve Nicholas' goal of complete unanimity in dogma and in everyday ecclesiastical affairs. Soon all Church money was controlled by the Over Procurator as was the power to virtually hire and fire lower and upper clergy.

6. In *Supplements [Pribavlenie] to the Writings of the Holy Fathers in Russian Translation* for 1862. [Author's note].

7. Count Dmitrii A. Tolstoi (1823-1889) was Over Procurator during Alexander II's reign from 1865-1880. He was simultaneously Minister of Education under Alexander II. In 1869 he founded the inspectorate of schools to maintain surveillance and supervise public schools. A promoter of classical education, Tolstoi, under Alexander III, became an extremely reactionary Minister of the Interior. See p. 72 of chapter VII.

8. F. G. Lebedintsev, a professor at the Kiev Academy, served as editor from 1860 to 1863. Later (1882-1887) he became editor of *Kievskaia starina [The Kievan Past]*.

9. See I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche, 1700-1917* (Leiden-Köln, 1964). An English translation of this important work has been completed and is scheduled for publication in 1987 or 1988.

10. *Ibid.*

11. At that time Grigorii was of the Kazan diocese. [Author's note].

12. Ioann (1818-1869) taught at both the Kazan and the St. Petersburg Academy, and also served as rector of both institutions. Later in life he became Bishop of Smolensk. His chief scholarly work was a treatise on canon law, *Opyt kursa tserkovnago zakonovedeniia* (St. Petersburg, 1851-1852). For more on Ioann, see part one, pp. 260-262.

13. See chapter VI, note 193.

14. Nikolai A. Sergievskii (1827-1892) was a priest and professor of theology at Moscow University. Kliuchevskii says of him: "His lectures acquaint us not only with contemporary theology, but with philosophy as well. . . He boldly opposed Feuerbach, the inveterate contemporary materialist who rejects God."

15. A. M. Ivantsov-Platonov (1835-1899) was a priest, professor and church historian.

16. Konstantin Kustodiev (d. 1875) also served as the Orthodox priest in the Russian church in Carlsbad. His correspondence added greatly to the success of the *Orthodox Review*. Evgenii Ivanovich Popov (d. 1875) was with the Russian church in Copenhagen before moving to London, where he lived for thirty-three years. He was a proponent of closer ties between the Orthodox and the Anglicans and translated nearly every book written by J. Joseph Overbeck (see note 104) on the union of the churches.

17. See his necrology, composed by Prince S. N. Trubetskoi and M. Korelin. [Author's note]. Sergei Trubetskoi, "Nauchnaia deiatel'nost' M. M. Ivantsova-Platonova," and M. Korelin, "Otnoshenie A. M. Ivantsova-Platonova k istoricheskoi nauke," in *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* (March, 1895), bk. 27, pp. 193-241.

18. See note in part I, chapter V, 2.

19. In 1882 and as an offprint. [Author's note].

20. In 1885 the thought arose to include in the new collected works of Tolstoi a special small volume of his religious-moral essays. In order to ease the difficulties of the censors, Tolstoi himself asked Ivantsov-Platonov to undertake the editing of the volume with an authorization to abridge material and make comments in special notes on all controversial passages. The work was completed. Tolstoi was fully satisfied, but publication was not permitted. [Author's note].

21. On Iurkevich, see chapter VI, note 41.

22. On Rostislavov, see chapter VI, note 35. I. S. Belliustin wrote an anonymous "Opisanie sel'skago dukhovenstva v Rossii" ["A Description of the Rural Clergy in Russia], which appeared in Pogodin's *Russkii zagranichnyi sbornik za 1858 god* (Berlin, 1859). See Gregory L. Freeze, "Revolt from Below: A Priest's Manifesto on the Crisis in Russian Orthodoxy (1858-1859)," in Robert L. Nichols and Theofanis G. Stavrou, eds., *Russian Orthodoxy Under the Old Regime* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978), pp. 90-124.

23. On this, see Nikanor of Kherson. [Author's note]. Nikanor (Brovkovich, 1827-1890) was an eminent church figure and a philosophically oriented theologian. He taught at the St. Petersburg Academy, served as rector at several seminaries and at the Kazan Academy, and was eventually named Bishop of Kherson. On the subject of monasticism, Nikanor wrote an article entitled "Iz istorii uchenago monashestva 1860-kh godov," published in *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie* (1896), nos. 1 and 2. See also part one, pp. 259-260.

24. A. I. Popovitskii was editor of the sensationalist journal, *Tserkovno-obshchestvennyi vestnik* [*Church-Society Messenger*] from 1874 to 1886. The journal was renamed *Russkii palomnik* [Russian Pilgrim] in 1887.

25. A. V. Gumilevskii (1830-1869) was a priest who edited *Dukh khristianina* [*Spirit of a Christian*] from 1862-1865.

26. See chapter VI, note 145 and part one, pp. 167-169.

27. From the "Report" of Prince Meshcherskii. [Author's note]. Prince Vladimir Petrovich Meshcherskii (1839-1914), a maternal grandson of N. M. Karamzin, was well-known for his polemical articles and belles-lettres.

28. See Smolitsch, *op. cit.*

29. *Ibid.*

30. *Ibid.*

31. Arsenii (Moskvin, 1795-1879) was important for his work to improve the ecclesiastical schools (he headed a commission set up in 1866 to make recommendations on the reform of the church schools) and also for apologetical writings aimed at the Old Believers and the heterodox. He had taught at the St. Petersburg Academy, was rector of several seminaries, and headed the sees of Tambov, Podolsk, and Warsaw before being named Metropolitan of Kiev in 1860.

32. *O pravoslavii v otnoshenii k sovremennosti.* This was the title of a collection of essays published by Fr. Feodor in St. Petersburg in 1860. [Author's note].

33. The book was published in *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, first as a special supplement to the journal and later as an offprint (Sergiev Posad, 1916). Apparently its publication was delayed on the advice of Professor M. A. Golubev. [Author's note].

34. Fridrikh Karlovich Lorents, a Russian historian of German background, wrote several widely used histories of the modern world. His *Istoriia noveishago vremeni s 1815 do 1856* [*History of Modern Times from 1815 to 1856*] was published in St. Petersburg in 1856, and his earlier *Rukovodstvo ko vseobshchei istorii* [*Handbook of World History*], first published in 1841, went through several editions.

35. Note the very interesting "memoirs" about him written by Archpriest V. Lavrovskii, his close disciple at Kazan: "Moi vospominaniia ob arkh. Feodore," in *Bogoslovskii vestnik* (1905), nos. 7-8, and (1906), no. 5. [Author's note].

36. See A. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi tserkvi*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959) and I. Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum* (Würzburg, 1953).

37. *Akrivia* is a concept of Orthodoxy that was basic to Byzantine life and culture. The defenders of *akrivia* (the *akrivistai*) insisted that the essence of Orthodoxy must be preserved through the strict maintenance of discipline and adherence to the fundamentals of faith as imparted by the apostles, ecumenical councils, and the fathers. This concept was vital in significance throughout the Byzantine period and its defenders saw themselves as nothing less than guardians of the faith. Supported by a large and complex theological literature and by monasticism, it also found expression in Byzantine flags and emblems. The *akrivistai* contributed greatly to the defense of the Church's internal autonomy at times of state encroachment and viewed the Church as the State's co-worker and partner, and at the same time were regarded as models of the highly ethical life. The *oikonomistai*, on the other hand, stressed the Church's freedom in Christ, which enabled it to make use of divine grace in managing its domestic affairs (economy), and for the welfare of the human soul. *Oikonomia* represented a willingness to depart temporarily from *akrivia*, without violating dogma, if it would help salvation.

38. Filaret (Amfiteatrov, 1779-1857) had participated in the Russian Bible Society in the early part of the century, but became more reserved to Biblical translation after the Pavskii affair (see note 40). Filaret's own ideas combined a saintly piety with scholastic erudition and a pronounced distaste for modern philosophy. He had served as inspector of the St. Petersburg Academy, where he was a defender of the old scholastic style of theological education in Latin. Having held several episcopal positions, he became Metropolitan of Kiev in 1837 and remained in that see until his death. See part one, pp. 228-229.

39. Archimandrite Antonii and Archpriest I. M. Skvortsov composed the Kiev note, under the close guidance of the aged metropolitan. [Author's note]. On Antonii, see chapter VI, note 120. On Skvortsov, see chapter VI, note 17.

40. An eminent philologist, Hebraist, professor at both the academy and university in St. Petersburg, court chaplain, and tutor to the imperial family, Archpriest Gerasim Pavskii (1787-1863) had made his own translation of the Old Testament for his courses at the academy. After he left the academy in the late 1830s, his students had the translation lithographed and it began circulating among the schools and clergy. The translation itself was marked by a liberal-critical tendency in its interpretation of the Hebrew text and it was attacked on these points. An official investigation into the matter was begun in 1842 and all copies were confiscated. More importantly, however, the affair provided the occasion for the conservative proponents of a return to the earlier "scholasticism" in Russian theological education to take charge in the academy and in the synodal administration, and in its wake both Filaret Drozdov and Filaret Amfiteatrov left St. Petersburg and the meetings of the Synod for good. See part one, pp. 230-233 and 249-252. Makarii (Glukharev, 1792-1847) had a brief career in the seminaries before first entering a seriously monastic life and then going off to Siberia as head of an important missionary endeavor. An outstanding Hebraist as well, he was convinced of the need for a Russian translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, and during his missionary labors he began to translate himself. He submitted translations of the books of *Job* (1837) and *Isaiah* (1839) to the authorities, but neither found favor and Makarii was officially reprimanded for his many appeals for a new Russian translation. See part one, pp. 223-227.

41. Evgraf Loviagin (1822-1909) taught mathematics and Greek in St. Petersburg and was the author of numerous works on Biblical scholarship and the Christian East.

42. Pavskii's translation appeared in the journal *Dukh khristianina* [*Spirit of a Christian*] in 1862 and 1863; Archimandrite Makarii's was published in *Orthodox Review* from 1860 to 1867, as a special supplement. [Author's note].

43. Mikhail Spiridonovich Guliaev (d. 1866) was a professor of the Bible and Hebrew at the Kiev Academy. Moisei Aleksandrovich Golubev (1824-1869), also a professor of Biblical studies, worked on the translation of the historical and wisdom books of the Old Testament, and also translated the writings of some ancient church historians, including Eusebius. Pavel Ivanovich Savvaitov (1815-1895) was well-known as an

archeologist and historian. He frequently contributed to the "thick journals" and supervised the publication of Metropolitan Makarii's *Great Reading Compendium*. Daniil Khvol'son was born a Jew in 1819 and received a Jewish education in the Bible and the Talmud with its medieval commentaries. He became a teacher of Semitic languages at various leading schools in St. Petersburg, including the university, the academy, and the Roman Catholic academy. He himself translated approximately two-thirds of the Old Testament for the Biblical committee at the St. Petersburg Academy.

44. Porfirii Uspenskii (1804-1855) was twice sent to the Orthodox East to survey the needs of the Christians living there. After these missions he became Bishop of Chigirin and in 1865 vicar of the Metropolitan of Kiev. To him belongs the honor of discovering the Sinai Codex of the Bible. He is dealt with in Theofanis G.Stavrou's *Russian Interests in Palestine 1882-1914: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1963). See also below.

45. Konstantin Ikonomos (or Ekonomos, 1780-1857) was a modern Greek writer who left Greece for Russia during the Greek rebellion against the Turks. He opposed the translation of the Bible into vernacular Greek, and in several works in his native language championed a strict adherence to church tradition, the theology of the fathers, and the Septuagint. See the article on his life and works in *Strannik* (July 1860), pp. 1-23.

46. Feofan Govorov (d. 1894) was Bishop of Vladimir from 1863 to 1866. He believed that the Masoretic text should be rejected in favor of the Septuagint version. With V. Mushtsyn, Govorov held that the Hebrew text had been corrupted by succeeding generations of Jewish scholars to cover over the evident Messianism in the Old Testament. The manner of writing Hebrew without punctuation or vowels facilitated, it was thought, arbitrary translation.

47. St. Issac's Square, completed in 1858, opened out from the front of St. Petersburg's central cathedral. The square and the cathedral became symbols of "official" Orthodoxy.

48. P. I. Gorskii-Platonov (1835-1904), a professor of theology, accepted only the Hebrew text's authority.

49. The Prophetical books, *Ecclesiastes*, *Genesis*, and the non-canonical books. [Author's note]. Pavel Aleksandrovich Iungerov (b. 1856) taught Old Testament and wrote voluminously on the subject. His culminating work, *Obshchee istoriko-kriticheskoe vvedenie v sviashchennye vetkhozavetnye knigi*, appeared in 1902.

50. Ivan Stepanovich Iakimov (1847-1885) went on to teach at the St. Petersburg Academy. The full title of his dissertation is "Otnoshenie grecheskago perevoda LXX tolkovnikov k evreiskomu masoretskomu tekstu v knige proroka Ieremii."

51. Iakim Alekseevich Olesnitskii (1847-1885) was professor of Biblical archeology at the Kiev Academy. He wrote extensively on the Bible, the fathers, and modern criticism, and his works on the Proverbs and ancient

Hebrew poetry established him as a leading specialist in those fields. See below.

52. See below.

53. Cf. his books on *Proverbs*, on the *Song of Songs*, on rhythm and meter in Biblical poetry, and on ancient Hebrew music. [Author's note]. *Kniga Pritchei Solomonovykh i eia noveishie kritiki* (Kiev, 1881); *Kniga Pesn' Pesnei i eia noveishie kritiki* (Kiev, 1880); *Metricheskiia formy drevne-evreiskoi poezii* (Kiev, 1871); and *Drevne-evreiskaia muzyka i penie* (Kiev, 1870).

54. Nikolai Vishniakov (1841-1911) was a Hebraist and professor at St. Petersburg Academy. His most important work was on the *Psalms, O proiskhozhdenii psaltiri* (St. Petersburg, 1882-1891). Fedor Gerasimovich Eleonskii (1836-1906) was a professor of Biblical history at the St. Petersburg and the author of *Razbor mnenii sovremennoi otritsatel'noi kritiki o vremeni napisaniia Piatiknizhia* (St. Petersburg, 1873).

55. Karl Friedrich Keil (1807-1888) was a Lutheran theologian from Dorpat and a follower of Hengstenberg. His *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments* went through several editions.

56. In the *Works of the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy*, beginning in 1871. [Author's note].

57. Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (1802-1869) was a German professor of theology at the University of Berlin. He fought against the prevailing rationalists of his day to preserve Lutheran orthodoxy. He established and edited the conservative journal *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung*. His major work, *Christologie des Alten Testaments* (3 vols., 1829-1835) protested against the newly fashionable historical-critical interpretation of the Scriptures and advocated a more traditional reading of the Old Testament.

58. The reference is unfortunately lost. [Author's note].

59. David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874) was a rationalist Protestant philosopher, theologian and biographer. He studied at the universities of Berlin and Tübingen and taught at the latter. Influenced by Hegel, Strauss expounded a developmental theory of formative Christianity. Higher religious synthesis is achieved when inherent conflicting forces and interpretations interact. His work includes *Das Leben Jesu Kritisch Bearbeitet* [*The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*] (2 vols., 1835-1836) in which he describes the Gospels as historical myth. Such writings forced him to retire from the academic theological world. Ernest Renan (1823-1892) was a French historian, philosopher, and scholar of religion. He entered the seminary of Saint-Sulpice to study for the priesthood but a crisis of faith prompted his departure from the Catholic Church in 1845. After describing Jesus as an "incomparable man," he lost his chair of Hebrew at the Collège de France. His chair was restored in 1870, but meanwhile he had written *Vie de Jesus* (1863) which attributed Christianity's development to popular imagination. In 1879 he was elected to the Académie Française.

60. Note his book *O Evangeliiakh i evangel'skoi istorii* (1864), occasioned by Renan's book.

61. Nikolai Ivanovich Pirogov (1810-1881) was a prominent Russian doctor and social activist. An outstanding authority on army field surgery, he made contributions to medicine in Russia and Europe, and gained European renown in 1862 when the best European doctors were unable to locate precisely where a bullet was lodged in the famous Italian statesman Garibaldi. Pirogov was invited to Asprononte where Garibaldi lay wounded, extracted the bullet, and supervised his recovery. Pirogov's *Voprosy zhizni* was in part printed in the *Journal of the Ministry of Education*, part XCI (July/October, 1856), pp. 339-380.

62. On Filippov, see chapter VI, note 241.

63. See Smolitsch, *op. cit.*

64. Mikhail Luzin (1830-1887), Bishop of Kursk from 1883 to 1887, was professor at the Moscow Academy. See Florovsky, chapter VII, page 81.

65. Fr. Iosif Vasil'ev (1821-1881), whose master's dissertation critically evaluated the teaching of the Catholic Church "or the primacy of the Pope," was sent to the Paris embassy church by the Synod in order to carry the Orthodox message to the Roman Catholics. Between the years 1858 and 1867 Vasil'ev published the Orthodox journal *L'union chrétienne*. His work met with some success and he converted several western scholars to Orthodoxy, including Abbé René François Guettée and J. Joseph Overbeck. He also promoted the movement among the Old Catholics and Anglicans for reunion with the Orthodox. A close friend of Count D. A. Tolstoi, Vasil'ev had great influence over church affairs in Russia in the last twelve years of his life.

66. Evsenii (Orlinskii, 1808-1883) was a former rector of the Moscow and St. Petersburg ecclesiastical academies. He became Bishop of Samara first, then Archbishop of Irkutsk before being transferred to Mogilev. He was also a member of the Synod. Leontii (Lebedinskii, 1822-1893), Bishop of Podol'sk since 1863, eventually became Metropolitan of Moscow in 1891. He had been sent to Paris in 1861 to consecrate the Aleksandr Nevskii Cathedral, established through the labors of Iosif Vasil'ev. Leontii made a strong impression on the French and was influential also in the conversion of Abbé Guettée.

67. In the grading system of that time in Russia, four and one-half was approximately equivalent to the American B+ to A-.

68. On Neander, see chapter VI, note 156.

69. Vasilii V. Bolotov (1845-1900) was a professor, church historian and theologian. Bolotov, like Ivan L. Ianyshev and General A. Kireev, sought a reconciliation with the Old Catholics and Anglicans. In opposition to the 1892 St. Petersburg Commission's denunciation of the Roman Catholic teaching of the *Filioque*, Bolotov asserts that this should not interfere with a reconciliation because it does not constitute a

difference in "dogma," but a mere difference in "theological opinion." The teaching that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father is dogma. The Roman Catholic claim that the Holy Spirit can also proceed from the Son is "theological opinion." See Richard Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy.*

70. Evgenii Bolkhovitinov (1767-1837), the Metropolitan of Kiev from 1822 until his death, was a most prolific writer on historical, literary, and polemical themes. His main preoccupation wherever he served seems to have been the compilation of archival materials and the production of short historical works, and he is best remembered for two dictionaries of Russian writers and his *Istoriia rossiiskoi ierarkhii* (Kiev, 1827). See part one, pp. 175-177.

71. The *Stoglav* Council, or Council of One Hundred Chapters, took place in the middle of the sixteenth century under Ivan the Terrible and Metropolitan Makarii. It represented a triumphal self-assertion on the part of the Russian national Church. Its spirit was sharply contradicted a century later by the reforms carried through under Patriarch Nikon, and even its decrees were set aside. See part one, pp. 26-32.

72. For the council of 1666, see part one, chapter III, notes 35 and 36.

73. As N. N. Glubokovskii notes. [Author's note]. Nikolai N. Glubokovskii (1863-1937) was a professor at the St. Petersburg Academy. He was known as Russia's "miniature Tillemont" because of his detailed studies of the church fathers and his fidelity to sources.

74. The historian referred to here is Sergei K. Smirnov (1818-1899), a professor and rector at Moscow Academy and author of *Istoriia Moskovskoi slaviano-greko-latinskoi akademii* (Moscow, 1855). He also wrote histories of other ecclesiastical schools and served on the editorial board of the *Writings of the Holy Fathers in Russian Translation.*

75. Petr S. Kazanskii (1819-1878) was a well-known Russian historian and theologian, and a professor at the Moscow Academy.

76. Cf. V. O. Kliuchevskii's appraisal: "People who knew him [Gorskii] long and intimately confirm the impression conveyed to the reader of his published works on church history that the talent for criticism was, so to speak, in Gorskii's very nature." *Otzyvy i otvety* (Moscow, 1914), p. 308. [Author's note]. Vasilii O. Kliuchevskii was one of Russia's foremost historians. He taught at the Moscow Academy from 1867 to 1906, and held the chair of Russian history at Moscow University from 1879 until his death in 1914. His five-volume *Kurs russkoi istorii* remains one of the best and most comprehensive histories of Russia ever produced.

77. Afanasii (Drozdov), then still a teacher at Moscow Academy. [Author's note]. Afanasii (1800-1876) enjoyed a brief period of enormous influence over Russian theological education under Over Procurator Protasov. In 1841 he was appointed rector of the St. Petersburg Academy, and beginning in 1842 he continued to supervise the academy as the vicar to the Bishop of Podol'sk. By 1847, however, he had fallen

out of favor and was transferred to the see of Saratov, and later became Archbishop of Astrakhan. See part one, pp. 245-248.

78. On Golubinskii and Delitsyn, see above.

79. Compare this with the "religious enthusiasms" of the young Petr S. Kazanskii. [Author's note]. Johann Georg Hamann (1730-1788) was a German religious philosopher, who, along with Herder and Jacobi, led a reaction against scholastic rationalism and dogmatism. François Fénelon (1651-1715), French theologian, educator, and Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cambrai, was the author of numerous tracts on varied themes, all of which, however, showed the influence of the mysticism and quietism popular in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. His writings were particularly popular in Russia during Catherine the Great's reign.

80. See the excerpts from the letters of N. P. Giliarov-Platonov to the rector of the Astrakhan Seminary, Archimandrite Veniamin, published in *Bogoslovskii vestnik* (February, 1913, pp. 108-122, which warned against scientific-rationalist apologetics on the premise that faith can be neither shaken nor strengthened by the inferences of reason. Natural deductions cannot explain the supernatural, historical trivialities and details have no religious significance, and all forms in general, even dogmatic formulations, are subject to changes in time and history. The Church is higher than "unanimity" [*edinodushie*] and even higher than the Gospels. Giliarov-Platonov cites Khomiakov. [Author's note].

81. "Taste and see" – an allusion to *Psalm* 34:8, which is used in the Orthodox Church as a communion hymn during the Presanctified liturgy.

82. Johann Karl Gieseler (1793-1854) was a well-known church historian and professor at Göttingen. His chief work was his *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1818).

83. Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1694-1755) was one of the first to apply modern historiographical methods to the study of church history. A professor of theology at Helmstedt, he was also one of the founders of the University of Göttingen and produced a widely used textbook on church history, *Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae* (Helmstedt, 1755).

84. On Staudenmayer and Kuhn, see chapter VI, note 166. Karl August Kahnis (1814-1888), a Lutheran theologian from Breslau and Leipzig, was a defender of Lutheran "confessionalism" against the new historical criticism. His three-volume study of Lutheran dogma was widely read in Russia, especially the second volume, *Der Kirchenglaube in seiner geschichten Entwicklung* (Leipzig, 1864). Friedrich Adolph Filippi (1809-1882) was a German professor of dogmatics at Rostock. His major works are *Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (1848-1850) and *Christliche Glaubenslehre*, 9 vols. (1854).

85. On Pogodin, see above, note 1. Vukol M. Undol'skii (1815-1864) was a well-known bibliographer and collector of materials on Old Russia. He was particularly interested in the close relationship between Russian and Greek texts as a means for explaining and correcting Russian

manuscripts. He also wrote a "Description of the Slavic Manuscripts of the Moscow Synodal Library," between 1846 and 1847, but it remained unpublished.

86. On Ioann Sokolov, see above, note 12. Genadii, the Archbishop of Novgorod from 1485 to 1504, is remembered in Russian church history for his struggle against the heresy of the Judaizers, and, most importantly, for the first complete Slavic translation of the Bible. See part one, pp. 14-19.

87. Veniamin was a Dominican friar of obscure origins who came to Novgorod during Gennadii's episcopacy and took over the actual supervision of the archbishop's Biblical project.

88. On Polevoi, see chapter VI, note 69.

89. Afanasii Prokof'evich Shchapov was a graduate of the Kazan Academy and taught Russian history both there and at Kazan University. He became famous for two public addresses he delivered in 1861 criticizing the recent reforms for their inadequacy in solving the plight of the peasantry, and for these he was arrested. His chief historical work is on the Schism, *Zemstvo i raskol* (St. Petersburg, 1862).

90. Petr Vasil'evich Znamenskii (1836-1917), an eminent historian of the Russian Church, wrote many detailed monographs and specialized on the history of the ecclesiastical schools. His most widely used work, however, was his *Rukovodstvo k russkoi tserkovnoi istorii* [*Handbook of Russian Church History*, Kazan 1870].

91. He was the academy librarian during the entire period of his professorate, before being appointed rector. [Author's note].

92. Sergii (1830-1904) was subsequently Archbishop of Vladimir. His work on the *Menelogos*, a collection of the lives of the saints arranged for daily reading, constituted his doctoral dissertation and was published in Moscow in 1875-1876.

93. E. E. Golubinskii, who began teaching at Moscow Academy in 1860, published two volumes of his *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi* in Moscow between 1880 and 1914. See below.

94. Nikolai F. Kapterev (1847-1917) was a respected but controversial Russian historian. His two studies of Nikon's time, *Patriarkh Nikon i ego protivniki v dele ispravleniia tserkovnykh obriadov* and *Patriarkh Nikon i Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich*, evoked bitter hostility from the Old Believers and were suppressed by Over Procurator Pobedonostsev.

95. Vasilii G. Vasil'evskii (1838-1899) was the first Russian Byzantinist, the founder of the journal *Vizantiiskii vremennik*, and from 1890 the editor of the *Journal of the Ministry of Education*. His studies of Byzantium remain to this day fundamental to scholars in that field.

96. One of Kliuchevskii's first important works had been a significant study of Russian hagiography, *Drevnerusskiia zhitiia sviatykh, kak istoricheskii istochnik* (Moscow, 1871).

97. Aleksandr P. Dobroklonskii (b. 1856) taught church history at Novorossiisk University. His *Rukovodstvo po istorii russkoi tserkvi*, 4 vols. (Riazan, 1884-1893), was a standard textbook. On Glubokovskii, see above, note 73.

98. Lebedev's dissertation, *Vselenskie sobory IV i V vv.*, was first published in 1879, and reissued in St. Petersburg in 1904. Ivantsov-Platonov's polemic with Professor Lebedev is contained in his book on religious movements in the east in the fourth and fifth centuries, *Religioznyia dvisheniia na vostoke v IV i V vv.* (Moscow, 1880-1881).

99. Ternovskii's main work was his *Opyt rukovodstva po tserkovnoi istorii* [*An Experimental Handbook on Church History*], which appeared in two volumes in Kiev (1878-1883).

100. On the *oikonomistai* and *akrivistai*, see note 37.

101. The Council of Lyons was held in 1274, and its main purpose was to effect a reunion between the Church of Rome and the Church of Byzantium. The union was agreed to by the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Paleologos, forced on his subjects, and was repudiated immediately after his death in 1282. The emperor had embraced the union as a political expedient – the empire that he had only thirteen years before reclaimed from the Latin regime that had ruled in Constantinople since the infamous Fourth Crusade in 1204 was besieged on all sides, and its most powerful enemy was the King of Sicily, Charles of Anjou. Michael, finding that the influence of Pope Gregory X was indispensable in restraining Charles, agreed to Gregory's price for his assistance: ecclesiastical union. The people and clergy of Byzantium, however, were still bitter over the Latin experience, and it was only with great difficulty and through persecution that Michael could maintain his hold on the empire and keep the union in force. Meanwhile, with the accession of Martin IV to the papal see in 1281 the union was for all practical purposes abandoned by the Catholics, as Martin adopted a policy of opposition to Michael. The next year Michael died and the new Emperor Andronicus II deposed the pro-union Patriarch John Bekkos and reinstated the pre-1274 Patriarch Joseph. The Council of Lyons also adopted some canonical measures that are still in force in the West, and is regarded by the Roman Catholic Church as the Fourteenth Ecumenical Council.

102. Bolotov's doctoral dissertation, *Uchenie Origena o sviatoi troitse*, appeared in St. Petersburg in 1879.

103. The *filioque* [Latin for "and (from) the Son"] is a word that was inserted into the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed by the Western Church and has ever since been a main point of the doctrinal dispute between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches. The Old Catholics [*Altkatholiken* in German] were members of the Roman Catholic Church who refused to accept the decrees of the 1870 Vatican Council defining papal infallibility. They eventually created a separate episcopal organization. Many of their leaders were university professors, and they held a meeting at Nuremberg in August 1870 to record their dissent. Their first congress was held at Munich in September 1871, and among its decisions was a resolution calling for reunion with the Orthodox Churches of the East.

Exactly a year later a second congress at Cologne took up organizational questions and the issue of reunion with other churches. A third congress at Constance in September 1873 also discussed reunion plans, and the following year a synod at Bonn assembled to study the *filioque* clause, the sacraments, the canon of Scripture, and other related subjects. This synod was the first in a series held yearly until 1879 and afterwards semi-annually. For a recent study of their relationship with Orthodoxy, see Leroy A. Boerneke, "The Dawn of the Ecumenical Age: Anglican, Old Catholic, and Orthodox Reunion Negotiations of the 1870s," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1977.

105. Ivan D. Mansvetov (1843-1885) was a professor of homiletics, liturgics, and church archeology at Moscow Academy. Among his numerous works are *Mitropolit Kiprian i ego liturgicheskoi deiatel'nosti* (1882) and his doctoral dissertation *Tserkovnyi ustav (tipik), ego obrazovanie i sud'ba v grecheskoi i russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1885). Nikolai F. Krasnosel'tsev (1845-1898), professor of church history at Novorossiisk University, wrote many studies of the Greek liturgy, such as *Patriarkh Fotii i vizantiiskoe bogosluzhenie ego vremeni* (Odessa, 1892). Konstantin T. Nikol'skii (1824-1910), a professor of church history at the St. Petersburg Academy, was the author of a standard textbook, *Rukovodstvo k izucheniiu bogosluzheniia pravoslavnoi tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1901). Aleksei A. Kmitrievskii, professor of church history at the Kiev Academy, produced many specialized studies of the liturgy, including *Sovremennoe bogosluzhenie na pravoslavnom vostoke* (Kiev, 1891).

106. See above, note 44.

107. See Smolitsch, *op. cit.* and A. Kartashev, *op. cit.*

108. Fedor Buslaev (1818-1897) was a renowned pioneer in the study of Slavic philology as well as a historian of art and literature. His *Obshchiia poniatiia o russkoi ikonopisi* [*General Concepts of Russian Iconography*, 1866) was a landmark in the history of Russian art. Nikolai Pokrovskii (b. 1848), the director of Russia's Archeological Institute in St. Petersburg, wrote many studies of iconography, and was one of the first to study Byzantine and Russian iconography in relation to church doctrine and liturgical texts. See his doctoral dissertation, *Evangelie v pamiatnikakh ikonografi, preimushchestvenno vizantiiskikh i russkikh* (St. Petersburg, 1892). Nikodim P. Kondakov (1844-1925), a student of Buslaev, became a professor at St. Petersburg University, a member of the Archeographical Commission, and head curator of medieval and Renaissance art at the Hermitage museum. He produced many important studies of Byzantine iconography, including *Istoriia vizantiiskago iskusstva i ikonografii po miniatiuram grecheskikh rukopisei* (Odessa, 1876), which was translated into French as *Histoire de l'art byzantin considérée principalement dans les miniatures*, 2 vols. (18861891).

109. Aleksei S. Pavlov published two documents dealing with pre-Mongolian administration of penance: *Admonition of a Spiritual Father to a Penitent* and *Preface to Repentance*. Mikhail I. Gorchakov (1838-1910) was an archpriest and specialist in canon law. Nikolai S. Suvorov published *Uchebnik tserkovnogo prava* in 1913. Timofei V.Barsov (d. 1904) was a professor of canon law who wrote several works on the

structure of the Holy Synod. Il'ia S. Berdnikov (1841-1914) was a professor of canon law at the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy. He wrote on the concepts of Orthodox *sobornost* and catholicity.

110. Makarii's *Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie*, in five volumes, began publication in 1849. A French translation, *Théologie dogmatique ortho doxe*, by J. Cherbuliez, soon appeared in two volumes in Paris (1859-1860).

111. See Florovsky, *The Collected Works*, volume VII, *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*.

112. On this see the note by the teacher I. I. Lobovikov, whose biographical sketch by N. I. Sargady for the biographical dictionary of the St. Petersburg Academy is in *Khristianskoe chtenie* for 1912. [Author's note].

113. The passage is from Gorskii's diary. [Author's note].

114. This was introduced into the statute at the insistence of the archpriests Ioann Ianyshev and Iosif Vasil'ev. [Author's note]. Ioann Ianyshev (1826-1910) at one time served as rector of the St. Petersburg Academy, where he sought to create a theological faculty comparable to those in German universities. See below.

115. See A. L. Katanskii, "Vospominaniia starago professora," in *Khristianskoe chtenie* 94 (January, 1914): 54-77; (May): 581-613; (June): 755-791; (September): 1067-1090; 96 (January, 1916): 45-67; (February): 184-212; (March): 283-308; (April): 394-420; (May/June): 499-515; 97 (January, 1917): 58-90; (March-June): 163-191; (July-December): 362-378. The 1914 installments were published separately under the same title (Petrograd, 1914). [Author's note; specific references added from bibliography].

116. Heinrich Klee (1800-1840), a student of the famous German scholar Rambach, was a professor of church history, philosophy, and theology. His chief works are: *Die Beichte* (Mainz, 1827); *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 2 vols. (Mainz, 1837-1838); and *Katholische Dogmatik*, 3 vols. (Mainz, 1835). On Kahnis, see above, note 84.

117. Cf. his essay "Ob izuchenii bibleiskago novozavetnago perioda v istoriko-dogmaticheskom otnoshenii" ["On the Study of the New Testament Period of the Bible in a Historico-Dogmatic Relation], *Khristianskoe chtenie* 51 (January, 1872): 31-75; (February): 217-252. [Author's note; specific citation added].

118. He was later a bishop and rector of the Academy. See M. N. Skabalanovich, "Preosviashennyi Sil'vestr, kak dogmatist," *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (January, 1909): 175-201; and P. Ponomarev, "Preosv. episkop Sil'vestr, kak uchenyi bogoslov," from *Pravoslavnyi sobesednik* for 1909. [Author's note].

119. *Opyt pravoslavnago dogmaticheskago bogosloviia s istoricheskom izlozheniem dogmatov*, 5 vols. (Kiev, 1878-1891). [Author's note].

120. Quoted from Aleksei I. Vvedenskii. See his essay "Sravnitel'naia otsenka dogmaticheskikh sistem vysokopreosviashchennago Makariia i arkhimandrita Sil'vestra," *Chteniia v obshchestve liubitelei dukhovnykh prosveshcheniia* 24 (February, 1886): 127-149; (March): 248-279; (April); 334-352. [Author's note; specific references added]. On Vvedenskii, see chapter VI, note 46, and below.

121. Professor Ivan Osinin (1835-1887) taught comparative theology and German at St. Petersburg Academy. Aleksandr Kireev (1839-1898), an army general who turned to writing and journalism, was an untiring champion of the Old Catholic movement, which he saw as an opportunity to expand Orthodoxy in the West. His ideas are preserved in the "Otchety" ["Reports"] of the Society of the Lovers of Spiritual Enlightenment, in which he served as secretary.

122. The book was published in Moscow in 1884. The chapter on the Church was originally published in *Rus'* for 1882, before the essay on the "Great Debate." [Author's note]. The reference is to Solov'ev's *Veliki spor i khristianskaia politka* [*The Great Debate and Christian Politics*] (Moscow, 1883).

123. *Istoriia i budushchnost' teokratii. (Izsledovanie vsemirno-istoricheskago puti k istinnoi zhizni)*, 5 vols. in one (Zagreb: Aktsionernaia tipografiia, 1887). The chapter on dogmatic development was originally published with words of approbation from the editors, as "Dogmaticheskoe razvitie v sviazi s voprosom o soedinenii tserkvi" ["Dogmatic Development in Connection with the Question of Uniting the Churches"], in *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie* (December, 1885), pp. 727-798. [Author's note; specific citatiions added]. The editor-publisher of *Orthodox Review* at that time was Archpriest Petr Preobrazhenskii.

124. See his *Commonitorium*, chapters 22 and 23. [Author's note]. Vincent of Lérins was a Christian writer of the fifth century. He wrote his famous theological treatise on the nature and development of Orthodox dogmatics and in opposition to Augustine's "new" doctrine of predestination and Augustine's "new interpretation" of original sin. For an analysis, see Richard Haugh, *Augustine and Eastern Christianity* and *St. Augustine and St. John Cassian*. The full title is *Commonitorium primum, seu tractatus versitate adversus profanas omnium haereticorum novitates*. It appeared in 434, three years after the Council of Ephesus. A complete Russian translation appeared in Kazan in 1868.

125. Several articles in opposition to Solov'ev's ideas on "dogmatic development" were written by T. Stoianov and Aleksandr P. Shost'in for *Vera i razum* in 1885 and 1886. See also the article by I. Kristi, "Chemu uchit teoriia razvitiia dogmatov," *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie* (February, 1887), pp. 286-314. [Author's note].

126. See the essay "Razvivaetsia li v dogmaticheskom smysle Tserkov," *Strannik* (May, 1889), pp. 3-37. [Author's note; exact citation added].

127. See his essay "K voprosu o metologicheskoi reforme pravosl. dogmatiki," *Bogoslovskii vestnik* (April, 1904). It was also published separately. [Author's note; from bibliography].

128. Christian Palmer (1811-1875) was a German Protestant theologian who published a great many works in German. His *Die Morale des Christentums* appeared in Stuttgart in 1864. Richard Rothe (1799-1867), a Lutheran theologian who studied in Berlin with Schleiermacher and Neander, was strongly influenced by pietism. After a long period of scholarly seclusion, he became an advocate of free theology. His theological system is developed in *Theologische Ethik*, 3 vols. (1845-1848), republished in 5 vols. (1867-1871).

129. Johann Michael Sailer (1751-1832), the Bishop of Regensburg, for many years taught ethics at the University of Dillingen in Bavaria, and is often considered the founder of the science of pastoral theology. Wilhelm DeWette (1780-1849) was a German theologian and the founder of the "mythological school" of Biblical criticism.

130. Joseph Ambrose Stapf (1785-1844) was an Austrian theologian. His *Theologia moralis in compendium redacta* was the official textbook for moral theology in the Austrian seminaries.

131. The Latin text was published in 1857, and the Russian translation (which contained no indication that it was a translation) appeared in Moscow in 1860. [Author's note]. Mechitaristen was the name of a Catholic order founded by Sebastian Mechtar (1676-1749), an Armenian national leader of significance. In 1717 the order opened a monastery, school, and library on the island of St. Lazarus near Venice. The monastery later became a center of publishing.

132. See Smolitsch, *op. cit.* and Kartashev, *op. cit.*

133. Hans L. Martensen (1808-1884) was a Danish Lutheran theologian. His *Den Kristelige Dogmatik* was published in Copenhagen in 1849.

134. V. F. Pevnitskii (d. 1911) was a professor at Kiev Academy.

135. From the protocol of the Council meeting of October 14, 1872. [Author's note].

136. See the *ukase* of March 19, 1873. [Author's note].

137. See H. Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der reformierten Kirche namentlich der Niederlande* (Leiden, 1879); and E. Sachsse, *Ursprung und Wesen des Pietismus* (Wiesbaden, 1884).

138. On Fr. Gerasim Pavskii, see above, note 40.

139. Paisii Velichkovskii (1722-1794) was the leader of a great monastic revival in the Orthodox world of the late eighteenth century. A student at the Kiev Academy, he was extremely disappointed with the spiritual conditions there, and left before he finished the course to search for someone who would teach him the true monastic life. His wanderings took him throughout the Ukraine and eventually to Mount Athos, where he remained for seventeen years and where he founded his own community, which was centered on the ancient Orthodox tradition of inner prayer. Paisii then moved his community to Moldavia, establishing monastic centers at Dragomirna, Sekul, and Niamets. Paisii's many

translations of traditional ascetic and spiritual writers, as well as those of his disciples, sparked a great revival of contemplative monasticism on Mount Athos, Moldavia, and Russia. See part one, pp. 159-161. Fr. Sergii Chetverikov's fundamental research of Paisii and the movement he inspired is now available in an English translation: *Starets Paisii Velichkovskii: His Life, Teachings, and Influence on Orthodox Monasticism* (1980).

140. See the book by John B. Dunlop, *Staretz Amvrosy*.

141. Serafim is one of the greatest and most popular Russian saints. Born Prokhor Moshnin in the town of Kursk, he grew up as a pious yourth and by the age of eighteen decided to enter the Monastery of Sarov. He passed his novitiate devoting most of his time to prayer and the study of Scripture and the fathers, then was tonsured Serafim in 1786. The same year he was ordained deacon and in 1793 priest. Serafim's true desire, however, was to live in complete isolation and constant prayer in the wilderness outside of the monastery, which he was able to do for the most part until 1810, when poor health forced him to return to the monastery. Still, he shut himself up in his cell, emerging only once, in 1815 to give his blessing to a couple that had come to visit him, until he ended his life of silence and solitude in 1825 and spent the rest of his life counseling the troubled and healing the sick who flocked to see this humble *starets*. There is an excellent short account of the life of St.Serafim by A. F. Dobbie-Bateman, reprinted in volume two of *The Collected Works of George P. Fedotov*, entitled *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*, pp. 246-265.

142. St. Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022) was a great Byzantine mystic whose theology, expressed for the most part in his numerous poems and prayers, provided the foundation for the later hesychast movement. There is a recent English edition of some of his works, translated by George A. Maloney, S.J., and entitled *Hymns of Divine Love* (Denville, N.J.: Dimension Books, n.d).

143. See Motovilov's description of St. Serafim in his famous *Zapiska protoiereia Vasiliia Sadovskago i N. A. Motovilova* (Moscow, 1904). [Author's note]. Nikolai Motovilov was a nobleman who came to Serafim with a physical ailment, was cured by the latter, and subsequently became one of his most devoted disciples. One of the best written examples of Serafim's wisdom is his "Conversion of St. Serafim of Sarov with Nicholas Motovilov Concerning the Aim of the Christian Life," reprinted in Fedotov, *The Collected Works*, vol. 2, pp. 266-279.

144. On Makarii, see chapter VI, note 114.

145. On Nil Sorskii, see note 91 in chapter I. On St. Symeon the New Theologian, see note 21 in chapter I. St. Theodore the Studite (759-862), was abbot of the monastery of the Studium at Constantinople and a defender of icons against the attack of the Byzantine Emperor, Leo V. On Maximus the Confessor, see note 46 in chapter I. On Isaac the Syrian, see note 43 in chapter I and note 48 in chapter VI. Mark the Hermit, urging repentance wrote *On Those Who Think To Be Justified by Works* in the early fifth century. St. Gregory of Sinai was an ascetic writer who

revived Hesychasm in the Greek and Slavic world in the middle of the 14th century.

146. On Fr. Leonid Kavelin, see note 275 in chapter VI.

147. The *Ladder* is the work of St. John Climacus, the abbot of the Mt. Sinai Monastery (579-649). It portrays the ascetic life as a spiritual ascent up a ladder with thirty steps, each representing a year in Christ's life prior to his public ministry. The *Ladder* was of great importance both for the Byzantine Hesychastic tradition and for the development of contemplative monasticism in Russia, from Nil Sorskii to St. Serafim.

148. St. Ioann Maksimovich (1661-1715) was Metropolitan of Tobolsk from 1712 to 1715.

149. The word for "old" here is *vetkhii*, which in the language of that time carried the connotation of something that is of the past, that has been fulfilled or replaced, as in the Russian for "Old Testament" –*Vetkhii Zavet*. [Translator's note].

150. *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the Years 1840, 1841* (London, 1882), p. 206.

151. See Palmer, *op. cit.*; I. Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum* (Würzburg, 1953); I. Smolitsch, *Leben und Lehre der Starzen* (Cologne, 1952); L. Denisov, *Pravoslavnye monastyri Rossiiskoi imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1910).

152. A *zatvornik* (pl. *zatvorniki*; *reclusi* or *inclusi*) is a special type of ascetic monk who confines himself in a cave or cell for ceaseless prayer.

153. There is an untranslatable play on words here. What Feofan says literally here is "they have made my *zapor* into a *zatvor*." Both words mean primarily "lock," but in an ecclesiastical context *zatvor* is the technical term for a state of monastic seclusion. [Translator's note].

154. *Put' ko spaseniiu*. The first edition came out in three parts from 1868 to 1869. [Author's note].

155. See above, not 66.

156. On Porfirii, see note 44.

157. Claude Fleury (1640-1723) was a famous French church historian. His *Histoire ecclésiastique*, which first appeared in 1691 in Paris, went through numerous editions and translations. Fleury's work actually reaches only 1414, but it was continued by others.

158. The two parts of the translation were first published in 1879 and 1881. [Author's note].

159. Nikodemos of Athos (1748-1809), a monk from the Athonite monastery of Dionysios, was called the "Hagiorite." With Makarios Notaras, he published the *Philokalia* in 1782 in Venice. Paisii published the *Philokalia* in St. Petersburg in 1793. This influential book is a

compilation of ascetical and mystical writings of the hysychast fathers. He also worked with Makarios on the *Encheiridion* and the *Evergetikos* and with Agapios Leonardos on the *Pedalion* which is a collection of ancient canons. Nikodemos was criticized by his contemporaries for his strong support for frequent communion.

160. See references in note 151.

161. Ioann Sergeev of Kronstadt (1829-1908) was an outstanding member of the married clergy who served at the Kronstadt naval base outside of St. Petersburg. His major written work is *My Life in Christ*. His extensive charitable work should also be noted. Ioann instituted several changes in the Orthodox ritual of his own parish. He insisted on frequent communion, lowered the iconostasis so that the altar was visible, and heard public confession where all simultaneously shouted their sins aloud. The Russian Church in Exile declared him a saint in 1964.

162. Gotthilf Heinrich von Schubert (1780-1860) was a German Lutheran and naturalist. His most important work, *Geschichte der Seele*, was published in two volumes in Stuttgart in 1830.

163. Note Fr. Ioann's opinions on the Jesus prayer and the divine names [Author's note].

164. See E. B. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (Chicago, 1954); T. Klauser, *The Western Liturgy and Its History: Some Reflections on Recent Studies*, tr. F. L. Cross (New York, 1952); L. Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety* (Notre Dame, 1955); L. C. Sheppard, ed., *The Liturgical Movement* (New York, 1964); T. Bogler, *Liturgische Erneuerung in aller Welt* (Maria Laach, 1950).

165. Note F. Ioann's youthful connection with the Sergiev hermitage and the disciples of Bishop Ignatii. [Author's note],

166. Note the sects of the Wanderers [*Stranniki*] and Adventists. [Author's note]. The Wanderers were a branch of the Old Belief founded by a man named Evfimii in the eighteenth century. They felt that the other Old Believer groups or "compacts" [*soglasie*] had become worshippers of the golden calf and prisoners of the Antichrist. Taking vows to become pilgrims, they traveled the roads and avoided contact with state officials, whom they regarded as agents of the Anti-Christ. See N. Ivanovskii, *Vnutrennoe ustroistvo sekty strannikov ili begunov* (St. Petersburg, 1901). The Adventists, founded by William Miller in the United States in the early nineteenth century, took their name from their belief in the imminent advent of Christ. They generally agreed first that the second coming would occur in 1843, then on October 22, 1844.

167. See G. Maron, *Individualismus und Gemeinschaft bei Caspar von Schwenckfeld* (Stuttgart, 1961) and G. H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia, 1962).

168. On Jung-Stilling, see chapter VI, note 90. His *Victorious History of the Christian Religion* (1799) advocated humanity's subordination to a higher form of religion. The *Molokans*, or "Milk-Drinkers," appeared first in the Tambov region in the mid-eighteenth century. A mystical sect

with teachings resembling those of evangelical Protestantism, it flourished among the little-educated Russian middle and lower classes. The name of the sect derives from their rejection of fasting.

169. Lord G. V. Redstock (1843-1913) was an evangelical preacher from the English aristocracry. After graduating from Oxford, Lord Redstock began teaching his own interpretation of the Gospel and devoting himself to philanthropic deeds throughout Europe. He preached his revivalist brand of religion in England, France, Holland, Switzerland, and India but it was in Russia that he made his mark. He made three very successful trips to Russia in 1874, 1875-1876, and 1878. The St. Petersburg aristocracry was especially receptive to his mission.

170. The Plymouth Brethren (also known as the Darbyites or Exclusive Brethren) originated in Ireland around 1828. They were also stimulated by the prophecies of Edward Irving.

171. On Countess A. A. Tolstoi's letter of March 28, 1876 to Lev Tolstoi concerning Redstock, see *Tolstovskii muzei* I (1911), pp. 267-269. [Author's note; from bibliography].

172. Colonel Vasilii A. Pashkov was a wealthy St. Petersburg philanthropist who emerged in 1878 as the leader of the Redstockist movement which became known as Pashkovism. Pashkov organized the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reasoning in 1876, and the Pashkov Palace was the site of many revivalist meetings. Under Church censure, this movement became known as the "Schism within the aristocracy." Pashkov was exiled in 1884. Baron Modest Andreevich Korf (1800-1876) was a member of the Courland nobility. Korf became an important political figure. His offices included chargé d'affaires of the Committee of Ministers in 1831, member of the State Council in 1843, Central Committee Chairman from 1855 to 1856, head of the Imperial Public Library from 1849 to 1861, Chief of the Second Department from 1861 to 1864, and Chairman of the Department of Laws of the State Council from 1864 to 1872. He wrote *The Accession of Nicholas I to the Throne* (1848) and *Life of Count Speranskii* (1861). In 1884 Korf was exiled for his Pashkovist activities. Count A. P. Bobrinskoi (d. 1894) was Colonel of the Corps of Nobles and Minister of Transportation. He devoted all of his energies and wealth in the last twenty years of his life to the Evangelical movement. His estates and neighboring lands became centers of religious teaching and of social and agricultural improvements. The sincerity and intelligence of Bobrinskoi's beliefs made a great impression on Tolstoi. Bobrinskoi retired from his post as Minister of Transportation in 1882 when Pobendenostev was pressing for the exile of Pashkov and him. Nikolai Semenovich Leskov (1831-1895) moved to St. Petersburg in 1861 and began his prolific literary career. In 1876-1977 Leskov wrote *The Schism in High Society: Lord Redstock and His Followers*, in which he expresses at once both praise and skepticism of Redstockism.

173. Tolstoi's famous *Confession* [*Ispoved'*] was written in 1879 and 1880, but was banned in Russia and could only be published in Geneva in 1884.

174. The reference here is to Benjamin Franklin's notebook "Rules of Conduct," in which he graded himself according to a scale of virtues.

175. See D. Ovsianiko-Kliuchevskii, *Istoriia russkoi intelligentsii* (Moscow, 1907).

176. Among the newer works on Tolstoi, the most important is the book by B. M. Eikhenbaum, *Lev Tolstoi*, 2 vols. (1928-1931), although it covers only the 1850s and 1860s. See also his *Molodoi Tolstoi* (1922). [Author's note]. A translation of *Molodoie Tolstoi* was done by Gary Kern and published in Ann Arbor, Michigan in 1972: *The Young Tolstoi*.

177. Pavel V. Annenkov (1813-1887) was the author of valuable memoirs of the 1830s and 1840s. See his *The Extraordinary Decade*, ed. by Arthur P. Mandel and trans. by Irwin R. Titunik (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1968).

178. Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), the famous French *philosophe* and novelist, was most famous for his *Social Contract*. Laurence Sterne (1713-1768), the English clergyman and novelist, was known for his humorous and eccentric writings in the sentimental style of the eighteenth century. His *Sentimental Journey through France and Italy of Mr. Yorick* (1785) was widely read in Russia from Radishchev's day onward. Jean Henri Bernadin de St. Pierre (1737-1814) was a French writer and disciple of Rousseau. *The Vicar of Wakefield* is a novel by Oliver Goldsmith (1728-1774) which tells the story of a generous, honest, and kindly priest of strong opinions, but who is easily duped by villains. He is lovable nevertheless, in spite of his gullibility and absurdity.

179. Stendhal (Henri Beyle, 1783-1842) was the first outstanding French author of the psychological novel. His description of the Battle of Waterloo in *La Chartreuse de Parme* (1839) provided Tolstoi with some of the latter's understanding of war. Xavier de Maistre (1763-1852) was a French novelist and brother of the famous Catholic reactionary Joseph de Maistre. Rodolphe Toepffer (1799-1830) was a Swiss author and painter. Proudhon (see chapter VI, note 199) met Tolstoi in Brussels in 1861, the year that the former published his *Le Guerre et la Paix*, which probably provided the title for Tolstoi"s famous novel. Isaiah Berlin, however, argues against anything specifically Proudhonist in *War and Peace*. See his *The Hedgehog and the Fox* (New York, 1971), pp. 59-60 and note.

180. Tolstoi's closeness to Rousseau was noted at the time by Apollon Grigor'ev in his article "Otzhivaiushchiia v literature iavleniia," *Epokha* (July, 1864), p. 7: "It would not have surprised us in the slightest if Lev Tolstoi had brought into the world something of the sort of Rousseau's *Émile* or even his *Le Contrat Social*." [Author's note; from bibliography].

181. See Eikhenbaum, *op. cit.*

182. On Karamzin, see chapter VI, note 85. On Novikov, see chapter VI, note 107. Aleksandr Radishchev (1749-1802) was a "repentant nobleman" and writer who gained fame for his famous work *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow* (1790), in which he highlighted the evils of

serfdom and the injustices in Russian society. Empress Catherine II ordered the book burned and its author exiled to Siberia.

183. *Utrenie svet* [*Morning Light*], Novikov's religious journal, was published in St. Petersburg from 1777 to 1780.

184. Angelus Silesius (1624-1677) was the pseudonym for Johann Scheffler, the Polish Roman Catholic poet. His religious songs of the oneness of the soul with God are sung by both Roman Catholics and Protestants.

185. *What is Art?* was written in 1898.

186. See D. Ovsianko-Kulikovskii, *Istoriia russkoi literatury XIX veka* (Moscow, 1908-1911).

187. Tolstoi colonies were agricultural communities organized according to the ideas expressed in Tolstoi's writings.

188. Mikhail A. Novoselov (b. 1864) was a teacher in a Moscow grammar school and a follower of Tolstoi. He was once arrested for possessing Tolstoi's exposé of Nicholas I ("Nicholas Stick"). In the 1880s he organized a Tolstoi colony in the Tver province. Prince Dmitrii A. Khilkov (1858-1914) was a young Guard officer who retired in 1884 and gave the better part of his land to his peasants. At one point he tried to found a Christian agricultural community, and after being arrested and exiled to the Caucasus he played a major role in arranging the emigration of members of the Dukhobor sect to Canada.

189. The brotherhood was established in 1894. [Author's note]. Nikolai N. Nepliuev (b. 1851), a social activist and writer, saw the goal of his brotherhood chiefly in providing a Christian education for children and thus ensuring that every aspect of their lives agreed with the spirit of the Christian faith. The graduates of the school were expected to enter the brotherhood, become teachers, and work the land of the state.

190. The quote is from Metropolitan Antonii Khrapovitskii. [Author's note]. On Antonii, see below, note 225.

191. See note 186, chapter V.

192. Aleksandr A. Blok (1880-1921) was the leading poet of the symbolist movement in Russian poetry during the "Silver Age." The quotation is from the first stanza of Blok's uncompleted poem "Retribution," Book 2 (1910-1911). There is an English translation of this poem in *The Twelve and Other Poems*, trans. by Jon Stallworthy and Peter France (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 107, where the line cited here is rendered as "the wings' wide shadow alone."

193. The *pochevenniki*, the "men of the soil," formed a circle in Moscow led by Apollon Grigor'ev. They opposed the older generation's romanticism and the younger generation's materialism and strove for a Christian naturalism, a return to the foundations, the soil, in order to develop the basis for an original Russian culture.

194. Edmund Burke (1729-1797) was a British political writer and statesman. After graduating from Trinity College in Dublin in 1748, he began to study law in England, only to abandon it for writing. Although in fact Burke's ideas and actions were often liberal and reformist, he believed that political, social, and religious institutions represented the wisdom of tradition, and hence the criticism of the French Revolution in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790).

195. Sergei Iu. Witte (1849-1915), one of Russia's outstanding statesmen, served as Minister of Finance from 1892 to 1903 and in 1905-1906 briefly presided over the Council of Ministers. In early 1905, as part of the movement for church reform in opposition to Pobedonostsev, Witte wrote a remarkable "Memorandum on the Contemporary Situation of the Russian Church," which stressed the importance of the parish and the "communal principle" that distinguished Orthodoxy in history. The memorandum was published in *Slovo*, March 28, 1905. See below.

196. Burke believed that unrestricted rationalism in human affairs was destructive and affirmed the utility of prejudice and habit in politics. He used words like "prejudice" and "prescription" to designate the way in which humanity has collected and condensed the wisdom of its experience. Prejudice he saw as the combination of reason and experience, reason alone being incapable of giving permanence to actions. Prescription is that which is established by custom. The British Constitution is prescriptive because it has existed for time out of mind.

197. Sergei A. Rachinskii, an admirer of the Slavophiles, resigned as professor of Botany at Moscow University in 1868 in order to promote education among the peasantry. In his view elementary peasant education should be largely religious and practical, combining the study of Church Slavonic and the Bible with reading, writing, arithmetic, and agricultural instruction. He founded a village school along these lines at Tatevo. Part of Rachinskii's treatise on pedagogy, *Absit omen*, was included by Pobedonostsev in the fifth edition of his book *Moskovskii sbornikh* (1901).

198. *Moskovskii sbornik*, first printed in 1896, was translated into English already in 1898 by Robert Grozier Long, under the title *Reflections of a Russian Statesman*. It has been reprinted with a new foreword by Murray Polner at the University of Michigan Press (1965).

199.Heinrich Wilhelm Thiersch (1817-1885), a German theology professor, was a convert to Irvingism. A man of sincere and profound piety, he lived in poverty and isolation. Pobedonostsev's translation of his *Über christliches Familienleben* (1854) appeared in two editions, 1861 and 1901. Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471) is often credited with the authorship of the spiritual classic *The Imitation of Christ*. Pobedonostsev's translation helped finance a school for orphans that he had founded in 1865. Frederick Le Play (1806-1882), a French sociologist and economist, studied the relationship of the family and workers to the social environment. His books, including *La Constitution essentielle de l'humanité* (1881), translated by Pobedonostsev in 1897, were influential among sociologists.

200. Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), the English romantic historian and interpreter of German romantic thought, tried to portray the spiritual reality immanent in the material world. To him, the material was mere dross or the clothing of the spiritual, and in this regard he reflected the beliefs of the romantics of his generation. His later works, such as *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History* (1841) and *Past and Present* (1843) attacked the laissez-faire theory and parliamentary government and affirmed a strong, paternalistic government. Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882), the American poet and essayist, became friends with Carlyle in 1832 and, under the latter's influence (as well as that of Coleridge and Wordsworth), became the leading spokesman of Transcendentalism, expressing a firm belief in the mystical unity of nature. Pobedonostsev translated his essay "Works and Days" for a volume designed to raise money for famine relief in 1873. William Gladstone (1809-1898), the British statesman and leader of the Liberal Party from 1868 to 1894, was also a deeply religious man, and his beliefs found expression in his politics. Pobedonostsev translated his *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scriptures* . Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) was an English philosopher who, along with Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley, was responsible for the popular acceptance of the theory of evolution. His writings also helped to establish sociology as a discipline, and Pobedonostsev translated his major work *The Study of Sociology*. Paul Carus (1852-1919) was an American philosopher and student of comparative religion who was born and trained in Germany. In such works as *The Soul of Man* (1891) Carus sought to establish the study of religion on a scientific basis. All of Pobedonostsev's "trans - lations" had deliberate and unmentioned omissions. See the book by Robert F. Byrnes, *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1968), pp. 289-290.

201. Many of the Puritan followers of Oliver Cromwell (the "Lord Protector," 1599-1658) in the English Civil War wore their hair cut short and were derisively called "Roundheads" because of the contrast with the fashionable wigs worn by the supporters of King Charles I, who were called "Chevaliers."

202. Erastianism is the doctrine that the state is a higher authority than the Church on all matters, even on those of a strictly ecclesiastical nature. The term itself derives from Thomas Erastus (1524-1583), a Swiss physician and theologian who authored a popular tract that denied the Church's power to excommunicate and argued that only the state should have the power to punish criminals. During debates on the relation between Church and state in seventeenth-century England, however, those who favored actual state control of the Church were dubbed "Erastians," and the term, though not quite accurate, came into historical usage.

203. See above.

204. Sergii Liapidevskii (1820-1898), Metropolitan of Moscow from 1895 to 1898, published the religious journal *Kormchii* [*Rudder*] which was founded in 1888.

205. Ioanniki (Rudnev, 1822-1900) had been named a member of the Synod and Metropolitan of Moscow only the year before (1882), and prior to that he had worked long and actively with ecclesiastical edu -

cation. He served in Moscow until 1891, and was then transfered to the see of Kiev. On Leontii (Lebedintsev), see above, note 66. Archbishop Savva of Tver is best remembered for editing and publishing the papers of Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov), and also left interesting memoirs, *Khronika moei zhizni*, in nine volumes (Sergiev Posad, 1897-1911).

206. Isidor Nikolskii (1799-1892) was Metropolitan of St. Petersburg from 1860 until 1892. Platon Malinovskii (d. 1754) was Archbishop of Moscow from 1775 until 1812. Ionafan Rudnev (1819-1906) was Archbishop of Yaroslavl from 1877 until 1903.

207.See Byrnes, *op. cit.*

208. See chapter VII, note 114.

209. *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie* and *Chteniia Moskovskago obshchestva liubitelei dukhovnago prosveshcheniia* had been published since the early 1860s. The third journal mentioned here, *Pribavleniia k tvoreniiam sviatykh ottsev v russkom perevode*, had been in existence since 1843 and was to be revived in 1892 by Metropolitan Antonii (Khrapovitskii) as *Bogoslovskii vestnik* [*Theological Messenger*].

210. *Vera i rezum* [*Faith and Reason*] (1894-1916) and *Vera i tserkov* [*Faith and the Church*] (1899-1907).

211. See chapter VII, note 24.

212. The *Trinity Leaflets* [*Troitskie listiki*] were published from 1884 to 1917. Archimandrite Nikon was a well-known monastic reformer. He took a leading role in the discussion of monasticism at the missionary congress held in 1908, and in 1914 the Synod, at the request of the Patriarch of Constantinople, sent him to Mount Athos to discipline monks who had been excommunicated for following heretical doctrines.

213. See Smolitsch, *op. cit.*

214. *Bratskoe slovo* [*Fraternal World*] was a religious journal published by N. I. Subboten and the *edinoverets* from 1875 until 1917. *Missionerskoe obozrenie* [*Missionary Review*} was published from 1896 until 1917.

215. Both the legend of the Apostle Andrew's sojourn in the Russian lands, which has its origin in the writings of the fourth-century church historian Eusebius of Caesarea, and a somewhat idealized account of Vladimir's conversion to Christianity are contained in the *Primary Chronicle*, or *Tale of Bygone Years*. The tale about Andrew gained particular importance in Russian tradition, for it provided the Russian Church with an apostolic foundation and justification for a preeminent position in the world of Orthodoxy, and found expression in a special national devotion to the saint and in the design of the Russian three-bar cross.

216. ""Tserkov', nauchnyia opredeleniia tserkvi i apostol'skoe uchenie o nei, kak o tele Khristovom." Akvilonov successfully defended his dissertation, but was compelled to rewrite it under the title "Novozavetnoe uchenie o tserkvi. Opyt dogmatiko-ekzegeticheskago izsledovaniia"

["The New Testament Doctrine on the Church: An Experiment in Dogmatic-Exegetical Research," 1896]. It was confirmed by the Synod in 1899.

217. On Katanskii, see above.

218. See Kartashev, *op. cit.*; Smolitsch, *op. cit.*; and J. Chaix-Ruy, *E. Renan* (Paris, 1956).

219. A reference to *Matthew* 18:12: "What do you think? If a man has a hundred sheep, and one of them has gone astray, does he not leave the ninety-nine on the hills and go in search of the one that went astray?"

220. See chapter VI, note 187.

221. In the words of Saltykov-Shchedrin's seventh letter in *Pestryia pis'ma* (1886), p. 185. [Author's note]. Mikhail E. Saltykov-Shchedrin (1826-1889) was one of Russia's best-known satirists of the nineteenth century. Many of his stories deal with official mismanagement, and his writings first began to attract attention during the era of the Great Reforms. In 1868 he became co-editor with Nekrasov of *Notes of the Fatherland*, and his writings of the 1870s and 1880s were largely directed at the contradiction inherent in reforms carried out by an anti-reformist government. To avoid the repercussions that his satire would inevitably bring from the censors he developed a special written language that he called Aesopic.

222. See Florovsky, "The Historical Premonitions of Tiutchev" in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, titled *Theology and Literature.*

223. On the Moscow Psychological Society, see chapter VI, note 276. Solov'ev's report, *Ob upadke srednevekovago mirosozertsaniia*, was delivered as a lecture in October of 1891, and criticized the historic Church for being indifferent to society. One recent author has described the essay as "the first Christian-modernist manifesto in Russia." See Donald W. Treadgold, *The West in Russia and China*, vol. I, *Russia 1472-1917* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 211.

224. See chapter VI, note 276.

225. Antonii Khrapovitskii (1863-1936) was Archbishop of Charkov from 1914 until 1917. He supported learned monasticism and felt it should guide the Church in all areas. He appreciated the collaboration of Church and State but thought that ecclesiastical power should be supreme. Khrapovitskii hoped to see the institution of a Patriarch with absolute authority over the Church.

226. Arsenii Briantsev (b. 1839), a graduate of the Kiev Academy, became Bishop of Ladoga, a vicar of the St. Petersburg metropolitan, in 1882. The next year he took over as rector of the St. Petersburg Academy. Transfered to Riga in 1888, he worked to improve the liturgical and other pastoral work of his clergy. In 1893 Arsenii was elevated to the rank of archbishop and sent to Kazan, where he attempted to make pastoral work effective among the Old Believers and Moslems.

227. Antonii Vadkovskii had belonged to the married clergy but after the death of his wife in 1879 he took monastic vows and became an archimandrite by 1883. His arrival in St. Petersburg in 1885 marked the beginning of a brilliant career as church administrator. Becoming Archbishop of the newly created Diocese of Finland in 1892, he also served as a permanent member of the Synod and became well-known in Western Europe for his work at the head of the committee formed to discuss the Old Catholic question. He was named Metropolitan of St. Petersburg in 1898.

228. See Antonii Khrapovitskii's 1889 essay *O monashestve uchenom* [*On Learned Monasticism*]. [Author's note].

229. On Bishop Mikhail Gribanovskii, see the unsigned biographical sketch included with the publication of the third edition of his book (Poltava, 1911). [Author's note].

230. Mikhail I. Karinskii (1840-1917) was a graduate of the Moscow Academy who was sent abroad to complete his education in 1869. Subsequently he taught for several years at the St. Petersburg Academy. His *Classification of Inferences* is regarded as his best work, and as the title suggests it is a work on logic. Heraclitus (c. 540-475 B.C.), known as the "weeping philosopher," was a Greek from Ephesus and one of the first metaphysicians.

231.See notes above and below.

232. Antonii's *Christian Orthodox Cathechism* was published in emigration, at Sremski Karlovci in 1924.

233. Very characteristic is Antonii's orientation in his essays directed against Vladimir Solov'ev (these are collected in the third volume of his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Kazan, 1909; 2nd edition, vol. 4. Kiev, 1917): "One writer who by force of philosophical and apologetical researches is struggling against the enemies of Christ, is apparently grieved that the truth unaided vanquishes its enemies so slowly and so imperceptibly. Doubtless he would be galled to see the faith of Christ scorned by high society and trampled under foot by a nihilistic and depraved youth. Instead, this thinker, in order that through the labor of spiritual life and science such spiritual gifts might be achieved through God's grace, before which the underhanded enemies of Christ would fall down, began to think about constructing social and ecclesiastical-state arrangements in which no one could subjugate or offend the Church and the power of the Church could operate without interference and victoriously conquer its enemies." (Vol. III, p. 8). Antonii upbraids Solov'ev for his vain confidence in the state, for not observing spiritual independence and freedom. "The author had no desire to take into consideration the fact that certain forms of social life, by their very essence, cannot enter into the Church, for their very existence depends on a life in accordance with the old man, the life of one still unfreed from sin." Such is the state which applies physical force, the measures of reward and punishment. The Church "should not and cannot ever discharge by means of state institutions the tasks which God has laid upon it. It would then cease to be a church, cease to be the union of human consciences." (III, p. 12). Antonii does not maintain that the Church has no "social tasks"

whatever, but simply that it must proceed toward their resolution along its own special and independent route. See his famous essay: "Kak otnositsia sluzhenie obshchestvennomu blagu k zabote o spasenii svoei sobstvennoi dushi?" ["How Does Service to the Social Welfare Relate to the Concern for the Salvation of One's Own Soul?"], *Sochineniia*, vol. II; originally published in *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* (1892) and *Bogoslovskii vestnik* (June, 1892). [Author's note; from bibliography].

234. See Kartashev. *op. cit.*

235. Questions about the person and nature of Jesus Christ were the subject of great controversy in the Church in the fifth through eighth centuries. The Council of Chalcedon, the Fourth Ecumenical Council, held in 451, was the first great attempt to resolve the controversies, and produced a famous definition that confessed Christ as being one person in two natures: divine and human. The decision of Chalcedon, however, was rejected by several national Churches of the East, and subsequently the Byzantine emperors tried to impose a solution that was more diplomatic than theological: the doctrine of monothelitism, or one will in Christ. This was then rejected by the Church at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, held in Constantinople in 680 and 681, which reaffirmed Chalcedon and confessed the presence of two wills in Christ: divine and human. See volume VIII of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky, The Byzantine Fathers of the Fifth Century.*

236. See Kartashev, *op. cit.* and bibliography.

237. Paul Ia. Svetlov wrote *Chto chitat po bobosloviiu?* [*What To Read in Theology?*] (Kiev, 1907). This work is a description of apologetical literature in Russian and western languages.

238. Antonii has the following to say on this subject: "Salvation is rebirth, rebirth is suffering; suffering, for the natural man, is the subject of revulsion, yet when the God-man suffered, suffering no longer served for the believers as a subject of revulsion, but as the subject of worship." (*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, III, p. 124). This is opposed to the understanding of sacrifice in the Old Testament. Cf. Svetlov's introductory essay on the inadequacies of western theology. See also his essays in *Missionerskoe obozrenie*, for example, in 1898. [Author's note; from bibliography].

239. Sergii Stragorodskii was a rector of the St. Petersburg Academy and the presiding officer at the Religious-Philosophical Meetings of 1901-1903. He played a critical role in the fate of Russian Orthodoxy after 1917, holding the position of *locum tenens* to the patriarchal throne after the death of Patriarch Tikhon (1925), and finally being named patriarch in 1943. He died the next year.

240. There is a recent study of Tareev in English: Paul R. Valliere, "M. M. Tareev: A Study in Russian Ethics and Mysticism," Ph.D. dissertation (Columbia University, 1974).

241. See note 240.

242. Platon (Levshin, 1737-1912) was the most prominent hierarch of Catherine the Great's reign, and Metropolitan of Moscow for thirty-seven years (1775-1812). In his thought he combined traditional piety with the ideals of the Enlightenment, and he exerted an enormous influence in the ecclesiastical education of his time through his numerous practical, historical, catechetical, and dogmatic writings. See part one, pp. 142-146.

243. On Lotze, see chapter VI, note 202.

244. During the review of the Moscow Academy in 1908, an explanation of Tareev's theological views was demanded, and a special hand-signed receipt was taken. Protopresbyter Ioann Ianyshev examined Tareev's writings for the Synod. See the article "Stranitsy iz izdanii istoriii bogoslovskoi nauki. Reviziia akademii v 1908 godu," in *Bogoslovskii vestnik* (1917), os. 6-7, 8-9, 10-12. [Author's note].

245. *Nauka o cheloveke* was published in Kazan in 1896 and 1903. [Author's note]. Volume one was entitled *Osnovnye problemy zhizni* [*Fundamental Problems of Life*]; volume two was *Metafizika zhizni* [*Metaphysics of Life*].

246. This is expressed most of all in the chapter on the fall, where Nesmelov provided a hypothetical scheme of deductions and motifs about the devil and eschatology. [Author's note].

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. Andrei Bely (1888-1935) was a Russian symbolist writer. See below, this chapter, section 5.

2. See V. P. Preobrazhenskii's article on Nietzche in *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* and a later article by S. L. Frank in P. I. Novgorodtsev, ed., *Problemy idealizma* (Moscow, 1903).

3. P. I. Novgorodtsev (1866-1924) was a philosopher of law who combined liberalism with a profound belief in Christianity. He taught law at Moscow University before the Russian Revolution. Later in emigration he became dean of the Russian Law Faculty in Prague (1922-1924).

4. Wilhelm Windelband (1848-1915) was a German philosopher and historian of philosophy. He was a disciple of Rudolf Lotze and Kuno Fisher, and he became the spokesman for the Baden school of neo-Kantianism. See *Präludien: Aufsätze und Reden zur Einführung in die Philosophie* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1884; 5th ed., Tübingen, 1914). Heinrich Rickert (1863-1936) was a continuator in a more systematic way of Windelband's thought; he also wrote a book about him, *Wilhelm Windelband* (Tübingen, 1914).

5. *Problems of Idealism* [*Problemy idealizma*] was a collection of essays derived from a symposium of leading Russian intellectuals who discussed their evolution from Marxism to neo-Kantianism. The same authors later contributed to the celebrated and very controversial collection *Landmarks* [*Vekhi*], based on another symposium in 1909.

6. The quote is from N. Berdiaev. A similiar point is made in his essay "Philosophic Truth and the Moral Truth of the Intelligentsia," *Landmarks: A Collection of Essays on the Russian Intelligentsia* (1909), ed. by Boris Shragin and Albert Todd, trans. by Marian Schwartz (New York, 1977), pp. 7-8.

7. Richard Avenarius (1843-1896) was a German positivist whose influential work was the two-volume *Kritik der reinen Erfahrung* (1888-1890), which earned him Lenin's enmity. Ernest Mach (1838-1916) was an Austrian physicist and philosopher. Like Avenarius, Mach was ferociously (and often misguidedly) attacked by Lenin, especially in the latter's *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*. Mach's best-known work is *The Science of Mechanics* (Leipzig, 18843).

8. Cf. Peter Struve's introduction to Nicholas Berdiaev, *Sub'ektivizm i individualizm* (St. Petersburg, 1901), xilxxxiv. [Author's note; page reference added].

9. N. M. Minskii (pseudonym for N. M. Vilenkin, 1855-1937) was a Jewish literary critic. His *By the Light of Conscience* [*Pri svete sovesti*] (1890) helped emancipate Russian thought from the "social command" by using Nietzsche's ideas to advance an esthetic revolution.

10. Fedor Sologub (Fedor Teternikov, 1863-1927) was a Russian writer best-known for his novel *The Petty Demon*, whose hero, Peredonov, became a symbol for a generation in revolt against the moralism of the Russian intelligentsia and in favor of sensualism and decadence.

11. Zinaida Gippius (1869-1945) expressed the intellectual aspect of Russian symbolism in her poetry. She married the literary critic and novelist Dmitrii Merezhkovskii. Both later emigrated to France after the revolution.

12. Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906) was the famous Norwegian dramatist who insisted on placing his characters in conflict with social custom in such plays as *Et dukkehjem* [*A Doll's House*, 1879]; *Hedda Gabler* (1890); *Vildanden* [*The Wild Duck*, 1884]; and *Nar vi döde vågner* [*When We Dead Awaken*, 1899]. Maurice Maeterlinck, was a Belgian symbolist and dramatist, whose zoological essay *The Life of the Bee* (1901), written in a mystical and metaphysical way, and his plays *Monna Vanna* (1902) and *The Blue Bird* (1909) helped win for him the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1911.

13. The Religious-Philosophical Meetings were the result of efforts by Russian writers to establish a common discourse with representatives of the Orthodox Church. The meetings took place from November 1901 to March 1903 and were presided over by Sergii Stragorodskii, rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy and future patriarch (1943-1944).

14. See his *Stat'i i aforizmy* (St. Petersburg, 1909) and *Dionis i pradionsiistvo* (Baku, 1923).

15. Cf. *On the New Religious Consciousness* [*O novom religioznom soznanii*] (1907) [Author's note].

16. His book *On Understanding* [*O ponimanii*, 1886] shows Hegelian influence. [Author's note].

17. *Russkii vestnik*, edited from 1856 until 1887 by M. N. Katkov, was a conservative journal which dealt with subjects of topical importance.

18. See A. Gratieux, *A. S. Khomiakov and the Slavophile Movement*, 2 vols. [English translation by Büchervertriebsanstalt].

19. Solov'ev's letters to Eugene Tavernier are collected in volume 4 of *Pis'ma Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva*, ed. by E. L. Radlova (1908-1925). See the foreword by Tavernier to his French translation of *Three Tales of the Antichist* (Paris, 1910). On Solov'ev and Tavernier, see J. Ageorges, "Wladimir Soloviev et Eugène Tavernier, d'après des lettres inédites," *La Vie intellectuelle* (1931) 10, 3.

20. "Skeptics of the Neva." *Vestnik Europy*, founded by Karamzin in 1802, ceased publication in 1830 but was revived as a monthly in 1866 and continued publication until the revolution. It was one of the most influential of all the Russian "thick journals" of the nineteenth century.

21. The letter of Solov'ev to Rozanov is in Solov'ev's *Pis'ma*, vol. 3, pp. 43-44. [Author's note].

22. Sergei M. Solov'ev (b. 1886, nephew of Vladimir Solov'ev and a symbolist poet, was ordained and eventually joined the Roman Catholic Church.

23. Ia. P. Polonskii (1819-1898) was a romantic poet of the mid-nineteenth century. Solov'ev's essay on Polonskii appears in *Niva* (1896), 2 and 6.

24. Valentinus (fl. c. 150) was the founder and first head of the leading schools of heretical Christian Gnosticism.

25. "The Apocalypse in Russian Poetry" ["Apokalipsis v russkoi poezii"], *Vesy* (1905, 4. [Author's note].

26. A. Belyi, "Vospominaniia ob A. A. Bloke," *Zapiski mechtatelei* (1922), 6; also in *Epopeia* (Berlin, 1922-1923), 1, 2, 3, 4 (they do not fully coincide and do not substitute for one another). [Author's note].

27. Anna Nikolaevna Schmidt (1851-1905) had mystical visions and saw herself as the incarnated Sophia descended to earth for union with Solov'ev. Some of Schmidt's writings were published posthumously as *Iz rukopisei Anny Nikolaevny Schmidta* (Moscow, 1916). The book is now extremely rare, but some idea of its contents can be gained by consulting Samuel D. Ciornan, *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Spirit* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1977), pp. 71-86.

28. *Novyi put'* [*New Way*] was begun by Dmitrii Merezhkovskii in 1903 as an outgrowth of the Religious-Philosophical Meetings, after they were

banned in St. Petersburg that year by the Over Procurator of the Holy Synod Konstantin Pobedonostsev.

29. Georgii A. Chulkov (1879-1939) was a poet influenced by mystical anarchism. He was a friend of the poet Aleksandr Blok.

30. P. N. Medvedev wrote and edited several works on Blok: *Dramy i poemy Al. Bloka* (Leningrad, 1928); *Pometki Al. Bloka v tetradiakh stikhov* (Leningrad, 1926); *Pamiati Bloka* (Petrograd, 1922); and *Tvorcheskii put' Al. Bloka.*

31. Mikhail Vrubel (1856-1910) was a painter of the late imperial period, who portrayed the figures of the romantic pantheon. Beginning in 1885 with a sketch for a new edition of Lermontov's poem "The Demon," he began a famous series of paintings of the Devil in a variety of forms. His work exercised great influence on Russia's symbolist writers.

32. Novalis was the pseudonym of Friedrich Leopold Freiherr von Hardenberg (1772-1801), a lyric poet and a German Romantic. Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), a German writer whose work *Buch der Lieder* [*Book of Songs*] established him as one of Germany's greatest poets.

33. V. A. Ternavtsev read the opening paper at the first of the Religious-Philosophical Meetings. He was the son of a mixed Russian and Italian family and a graduate of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. He disappeared after the revolution and was later reported to be in a labor camp, where he apparently died sometime before the Second World War.

34. Lev Tikhomirov (1852-1923) was a former member of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia who repudiated his republican views in favor of monarchism. Among other things, he sought to harmonize nationalism and conservatism.

35. See above.

36. P. I. Leporskii (b. 1871) was a professor at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy.

37. Aleksandr I. Brilliantov, professor of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, was a theologian, philosopher and church historian. In the 1890s he taught apologetics at the Tula Seminary, concentrating on the Old Believers. He was an authority in Russia on John Scotus Eriugena, especially concerning the Greek influences on the thought of the medieval Latin theologian.

38. Fr. Ioann Slobodskii was a prominent clerical participant in the Religious-Philosophical Meetings.

39. On Sollertinskii, see above, chapter VII

40. See Katashev, *op. cit.* and Smolitsch, *op. cit.*

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. The history of the "Athos disputes" has still to be written. At present only a polemical and partisan literature exists on the subject. The debate broke out over the book written by the monk Ilarion, *In the mountains of the Caucasus. A conversation between two elder ascetics concerning the inner union of our hearts with the Lord through the prayer of Jesus Christ; or the spiritual activity of contemporary hermits, composed by the hermit of the Caucasus mountains, the monk Ilarion* [*Na gorakh Kavkaza. Beseda dvukh startsev podvizhnikov o vnutrennem edinenii s Gospodom nashikh serdets chrez molitvu Iisus Khristovu ili dukhovnaia deiatel'nost' sovremennykh pustinnikov, sostavil pustynnozhitel' Kavkazskikh gor skhimonakh Ilarion*], first edition (Batalpashinsk, 1907); second edition, corrected and considerably expanded, 1910; third edition (Kievskaia Percherskaia Lavra, 1912). At first this book was warmly greeted in the monastic milieu, but many began to view as a failing the daring with which Ilarion spoke about the divine presence in prayer and which he termed the calling upon the name of Jesus "by God Himself." It would seem that this was not so much a theological assertion as much as it was simply a description of the reality of prayer. But even this reality seemed too daring. Psychologism in the explanation of prayer appeared to many safer, more humble, and more pious. A debate started in the press, especially in the journal *Russkii inok* [*The Russian Monk*], published by the Pochaev monastery. Archimandrite Antonii spoke out sharply against Ilarion. All the polemical material was subsequently collected in the anonymous *Holy Orthodoxy and the Heresy of the Divine Names* [*Sv. pravoslavie i imiabozhnicheskaia eres'*] (Kharkov, 1916). [Author's note].

2. Berdiaev sees in Russian "rootlessness" the source and pledge of creative productivity. This recalls Herzen and his enthusiasm for young Russia's "plasticity." By contrast, earlier Berdiaev insisted on the organic moments of growth (see his book on Khomiakov). "Rootlessness in nineteenth-century Russian thought, particularly in Russian religious thought, was a source of unusual freedom, unknown to the peoples of the West, who are too bound by their history. . . . Our thought, once awakened, became radical and bold. We shall hardly repeat such a freedom-loving and daring act. Rootless and schismatic thought will always be freer than thought rooted in and bound by tradition. . . . Our religious thought began without tradition after a five hundred year hiatus in Orthodox thought." (p. 313). [Author's note]. Berdiaev's book *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov* was published in Moscow in 1912.

3. John Henry Newman, *Essays and Sketches*, ed. with a preface and introduction by Charles F. Harold (New York, 1948), vol. 2, p. 371.

4. *Phyletism* (Greek: *phyle* for tribe or nation) was a term applied to the ecclesiastical nationalism in the newly restored Bulgarian Church (1872). The patriarch of Constantinople, who opposed the election of an autonomous Bulgarian exarch, convened a pan-Orthodox synod to deal with the matter. Only Greek representatives came. The synod condemned the Bulgarian "seccession" for attempting to establish an autonomous church on purely national grounds (*phyletism*).

5. See above.

6. Karl Barth (1886-1968), a neo-orthodox Protestant theologian, wrestled with the problems of modernism (*Church Dogmatics*, 1932) and Christology with the aim of providing a Christian reply to the failure of the liberalism and rationalism of the Victorian era. Emile Brunner (1889-1966), a Swiss Protestant theologian, was professor of theology at the University of Zürich. His theological position was close to that of Barth. For an extended critique by Florovsky of Emil Bruner's theology, see "The Last Things and the Last Events," in *Creation and Redemption*, volume III in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, pp. 243-265.

7. *Slova i rechi* [*Sermons and Addresses*] (1882), vol. 4, pp. 151-152. The sermon was delivered in 1841 on the day of St. Aleksii. [Author's note].